

The Gazette



of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 38] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1953

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 12th September 1953 :—

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
226	S. R. O. 1652, dated the 26th August 1953.	Election Commission, India.	Election Petition No. 182 of 1952.
227	S. R. O. 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1657, 1658 and 1659, dated the 9th September 1953.	Ministry of Commerce and Industry.	The Central Government rescinds the notifications Nos. S. R. O. 700, dated the 30th September 1950, S. R. O. 873, dated the 7th November 1950, S. R. O. 579, dated the 21st April 1951, S. R. O. 501, dated the 2nd September 1950, S. R. O. 971, dated the 25th November 1950, S. R. O. 964, dated the 23rd November 1950, S. R. O. 965, dated the 23rd November 1950.
228	S. R. O. 1698, dated the 1st September 1953.	Election Commission, India.	Publication of the names of the candidates and election agents in respect of elections to the House of the People or the Council of States or the Electoral College of Manipur, Tripura or Kutch, who have incurred disqualifications under certain sections of the Representation of the People Act, 1951.
229	S. R. O. 1699, dated the 5th September 1953.	Ditto.	Election Petition No. 6/175 of 1952.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

PART II—Section 3**Statutory Rules and Orders issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and Central Authorities (other than the Chief Commissioners).****ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA***New Delhi, the 11th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1704.—In pursuance of sub-rule (5) of rule 114 of the Representation of the People (Conduct of Elections and Election Petitions) Rules, 1951, the name of the person shown in column 1 of the Schedule below who having been nominated as a candidate for bye election to the House of the People from the constituency specified in column 2 thereof, and having appointed himself to be his election agent at the said bye election, has, in accordance with the decision given by the Election Commission under sub-rule (4) of the said rule, failed to lodge the return of election expenses within the time required and has thereby incurred the disqualifications under clause (c) of section 7 and section 143 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (XLIII of 1951), is hereby published:—

SCHEDULE

Name of the Candidate	Name of constituency
1	2
Shri Basudeo Prasad.	Bhagalpur cum Purnea.

[No. BR-P/53(78)/BYE/2565.]

By order,
P. N. SHINGHAL, Secy.

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS*New Delhi, the 14th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1705.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Act No. LXXVII of 1952, the Government of India are pleased to authorise the following Police Officers of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to exercise powers under that Section:

Serial No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri M. D. Agharkar	... Sub-Inspector of Police
2.	Shri R. Jaganathan	... Sub-Inspector of Police

[No. 34/114/52-Police II.]

New Delhi, the 15th September 1953

S.R.O. 1706.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 27 of the Indian Arms Act, 1878 (XI of 1878) the Central Government is pleased to exempt Major James J. Mullen of the United Nations Military Observer Group from the operation of the prohibitions and directions contained in section 6 of the said Act, in respect of one 9 mm. bore pistol No. 6392, with 50 rounds of ammunition of 9 mm. bore and a spare magazine.

[No. 9/46/53-Police (I).]

U. K. GHOSHAL, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 15th September 1953

S.R.O. 1707.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution read with articles 313 and 372 thereof, and paragraph 19 of the Adaptation of Laws Order, 1950, the President hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the rules published with the notification of the Government of India in the late Home Department No. F.9-19/30-Ests., dated the 27th February 1932, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said Rules, after the existing entries under the heading "Commerce Department" the following sub-heading and the entries thereunder shall be added, namely:—

Central Sericultural Research Station, Berhampore.

Class III (Non-Ministerial)
Posts.

Botanist, Entomologist, Pathologist, Biochemist, Assistant Botanist, Assistant Entomologist, Assistant Pathologist, Analytical Chemist, Assistant-in-Charge (Kalimpong), Mechanic, Artist-cum-Photographer.	}	msoseixn Com- missioner and x-Offici o sint Secretary	Textile Com- missioner and Ex-Officio Joint Secretary	All	Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

Class III (Ministerial) Posts.

Assistant-in-Charge,
(Berhampore),
Accountant-cum-Cashier,
Storekeeper.

Class III (Non-Ministerial)
Posts.

Rearing Assistant, Botanical Fieldman, Bio-Chemical Fieldman, Laboratory Assistant, Field Assistant.	}	Under Secre- tary, Branch Secretariat, Bombay.	Under Secre- tary, Branch Secretariat, Bombay.	All	Textile Com- missioner and Ex-Officio Joint Sec- retary.

Ministerial

Clerk

Class IV Posts.

Rearer, Reeler, Skilled Mali, Skilled Labourer, Trained Attendant, Daftry, Mali, Labourer, Laboratory Attendant, Laboratory Boy, Darwan, Peon, Watchman.	}	Officer-in- Charge, C.S. R.S., Berham- pore.	Officer-in- Charge, C.S. R.S., Berham- pore.	All	Textile Com- missioner and Ex- Officio Joint Secretary.

[No. 7/24/53-Ests.]

S.R.O. 1708.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution read with articles 313 and 372 thereof, and paragraph 19 of the Adaptation of Laws Order, 1950, the President hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the rules published with the notification

of the Government of India in the late Home Department No. F.9-19/30-Ests., dated the 27th February, 1932, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said Rules, the following headings and the entries thereunder shall be inserted, namely:—

Cabinet Secretariat

Clerks, Gestetner, Operators, Staff Car Drivers.	Deputy Secretary.	Deputy Secretary.	All	Secretary.
Jamadars, Daftries, Peons, Chowkidars, Sweepers.	Under/Assistant Secretary.	Under/Assistant Secretary. Deputy Secretary.	(i) to (v) and (vii)	Deputy Secretary.

Central Statistical Organisation

Assistants, Technical Assistants, Research Assistants, Senior Artists, Junior Artists, Stenographers, Telephone Operators, Clerks, Staff Car Drivers, Daftries, Peons, Sweepers, Chowkidars.	Joint Director	Joint Director Deputy Secretary.	(i) to (v) and (vii)	Deputy Secretary.
	Assistant Director.	Assistant Director Joint Director	(i) to (v) and (vii)	Joint Director Deputy Secretary.

[No. 7/25/53-Ests.]

S.R.O. 1709.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution read with articles 313 and 372 thereof, and paragraph 19 of the Adaptation of Laws Order, 1950, the President hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the late Home Department No. F.9/2/33-Ests., dated the 9th January 1934, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said Rules, the following headings and the entries thereunder shall be inserted, namely:—

Cabinet Secretariat

Research Officers, Private Secretary to Secretary, Assistants, Economic Investigators (Grade I), Economic Assistants, Stenographers.	Secretary	Joint/Deputy Secretary.	(i) to (v)
		Secretary.	All

Central Statistical Organisation

Research Officers, Economic Investigators (Grade I).	Joint/Deputy Secretary.	Joint/Deputy Secretary.	All
------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-----

[No. 7/25/53-Ests.]

S. P. MAHNA, Asstt. Secy

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 12th September 1953

S.R.O. 1710.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Chandernagore (Administration) Regulation 1952, (No. 1 of 1952), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Advisory Council consisting of the following members, namely:—

1. Sri Debendra Nath Dash.
2. Dr. Jatindra Nath Bor, D.Sc.

3. Sri Brahma Baran Ghose.
4. Sri Prakash Chandra Das.
5. Dr. Subodh Chandra Roy, B.Sc., M.B., D.T.M.

[No. D.5151Eur.I/53.]

[No. 889 Eur 1.]

A. N. MEHTA, Under Secy

MINISTRY OF STATES*New Delhi, the 11th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1711.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Entry 3(b) of the Table Annexed to Schedule I to the Indian Arms Rules, 1951, the Central Government is pleased to specify Kumar Shri Sardarsinhji a member of the family of the Ruler of Amballara for the purposes of that entry.

[No. 163-D.]

H. C. MAHINDROO, Under Secy

MINISTRY OF FINANCE**Department of Economic Affairs***New Delhi, the 10th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1712.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Rehabilitation Finance Administration Act, 1948 (XII of 1948), and in partial modification of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, No. F.10(25)-F.I/52, dated the 11th July, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. C. Das Gupta, Chief Administrator, as Chairman of the Rehabilitation Finance Administration, constituted under the said Act, in the place of Shri Ram Gopal, and nominates Dr. Susilranjan Chatterjee, Member, House of the People, as a non-official member of that Administration in the vacancy caused by the death of Pandit Lakshmi Kant Mohtra.

[No. F.10(25)-F.I/52.]

N. C. SEN GUPTA, Dy. Secy

MINISTRY OF FINANCE (REVENUE DIVISION)**EXCESS PROFITS TAX***New Delhi, the 10th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1713.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 3 of the Excess Profits Tax Act, 1940 (XV of 1940) the Central Board of Revenue directs that the following amendment shall be made in the schedule to its Notification No. 30C.A., dated the 14th September 1940, namely:—

In column 1 of entry 2 of the said Schedule for the words "Central Range, Madras" the words "Madras Range—I, Madras" shall be substituted.

[No. 60.]

K. B. DEB, Under Secy

HEADQUARTERS ESTABLISHMENTS*New Delhi, the 11th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1714.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (ii) of rule 2 of the Tribunal Rules, 1946, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri G. R. Hegde,

Income-tax Officer, as Authorised Representative to appear, plead and act for an Income-tax Authority who is party to any proceedings before the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, with effect from the 8th August 1953.

[No. 66.]

G. L. POPHALE, Dy. Secy.

CENTRAL EXCISE

New Delhi, the 14th September 1953

S.R.O. 1715.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 37 of the Central Excise and Salt Act, 1944 (I of 1944), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the Central Excise Rules, 1944, namely:—

In sub-rule (1) of rule 52-A of the said rules, the words "for home consumption" shall be omitted.

[No. 22.]

M. P. ALEXANDER, Under Secy.

CENTRAL EXCISES

New Delhi, the 19th September 1953

S.R.O. 1716.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 16A of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, the Central Government hereby—

(1) specifies the following areas for purposes of the said sub-rule, namely, the districts of Saharanpur, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Agra, Aligarh, Bulandshahr, Mathura and Dehra Dun in the State of Uttar Pradesh;

(2) prescribes the licence fee of eight annas for purposes of clause (b) of the said sub-rule.

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st day of October 1953.

[No. 21.]

E. S. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Jt. Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

CENTRAL TEA BOARD

New Delhi, the 15th September 1953

S.R.O. 1717.—The following amendment in the Central Tea Board By-laws 1951, which has been made by the Central Tea Board in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 16 of the Central Tea Board Act, 1949 (XIII of 1949), read with sub-rule (2) of rule 24 of the Central Tea Board Rules, 1950, and which has been confirmed by the Central Government as required in sub-section (2) of the said section, is hereby published for general information:—

In by-law 10 of the said By-laws, for the words "five members" the words "three members" shall be substituted.

[No. 46(3)Plant/53.]

A. NANU, Dy. Secy.

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th September 1953

S.R.O. 1718.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (LXV of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri L. P. Misra, Messrs. Hindustan Motors Limited, 8, Royal Exchange Place, Calcutta-1, as a member of the Development Council for the

scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture and production of Internal Combustion Engines and Power Driven Pumps, constituted in the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, No. S.R.O. 455, dated the 4th March, 1953, to represent the interests of owners of industrial undertakings in the said scheduled industries, *vice* Mr. A. J. Lund.

[No. 5(8)IA(G)/52.]

P. S. SUNDARAM, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

New Delhi, the 9th September 1953

S.R.O. 1719.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 11 of the Sugar and Gur Control Order, 1950 the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the Notification of the late Ministry of Agriculture No. S.R.O. 792, dated the 19th October, 1950, namely—

In "THE SCHEDULE" to the said notification under the column "Designation of Officer"—

For "Director of Rationing and Civil Supplies, Delhi"

Read "Controller of Rationing, Delhi".

[SV-105(3)/51-III.]

New Delhi, the 10th September 1953

S.R.O. 1720.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (3) of clause 1 of the Foodgrains (Licensing and Procurement) Order, 1952 and in partial modification of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture, No. S.R.O. 1949, dated the 5th November, 1952, the Central Government hereby directs that the said Order shall apply to the State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union in respect of wheat and its products with effect from the 12th September, 1953.

[No. PYII-652(23).]

P. A. GOPALAKRISHNAN, Joint Secy.

(Agriculture)

New Delhi, the 12th September 1953

S.R.O. 1721.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4(4)(v) of the Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930 (XXIV of 1930), the Central Government is pleased to appoint Pandit Binoda Nanda Jha, M.L.A., Ward No. 12, Deoghar, District Santhal Paraganas, as a member of the Governing Body of the Indian Lac Cess Committee to represent the cultivators of lac in Bihar for a term of 3 years with effect from 1st October, 1953.

[No. F.3-48/53-Com-I.]

F. C. GERA, Under Secy.

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 10th September 1953

S.R.O. 1722.—In this Ministry's Notification No. F.5-1/53-Dte.II, dated the 28th January, 1953, published in the *Gazette of India* as S.R.O. 263, please *substitute* the word 'Blue-cured' for the word 'Blue-cured' occurring in Groups I and II under the column 'Variety and grades of tobacco' in the Table therein,

(ii) For 'Hogsheda' under column 2 against Group III of the Table, please *read* the word 'Hogshead'.

(iii) The Comma (,) occurring between the letters 'V' and 'Y' of the word 'levy' in the heading of column 3 of the Table, should be deleted.

[No. F.5-1/53-Dte.II.]

S. D. UDHRAIN, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING*New Delhi, the 11th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1723.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (XXXVII of 1952), the Central Government hereby directs that the film entitled "Split Second" produced by RKO Radio Pictures Inc., U.S.A., shall be deemed to be an uncertified film in the whole of India.

[No. 11/9/53-FII.]

A. N. BERY, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER*New Delhi, the 14th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1724.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (LIV of 1948), and in partial modification of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Mines and Power No. EL-II-1(9), dated the 20th January, 1950, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T. Sivasankar, I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Irrigation and Power, as Chairman of the Central Electricity Authority *vice* Shri A. N. Khosla, I.S.E.

[No. EL-II-1(84).]

A. R. KHANNA, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH**CORRIGENDUM***New Delhi, the 9th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1725.—The letter 'J' should be inserted after the word 'Schedule' in this Ministry's Notification No. S.R.O. 1101, dated the 4th June, 1953, published on pages 841-842 of the *Gazette of India*, Part II, Section 3, dated the 13th June, 1953.

[No. F.1-16/52DS.]

S. DEVANATH, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS**POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS***New Delhi, the 10th September 1953*

S.R.O. 1726.—Whereas a dispute has arisen between the Telegraph Authority and the Municipal Commissioners of Kotrung regarding the expenses to be paid by the Telephone District Authorities to the Municipal Commissioners aforesaid with respect to the restoration of the road disturbed by the said authorities for the purpose of laying cable along the Haranathpore Road within the Kotrung Municipality;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 15 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 (XIII of 1885), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T. H. Dixon, Superintending Engineer, Calcutta Circle, Calcutta, to determine the said dispute.

[No. NB.III-7/53.]

M. B. BHIDE, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 10th September 1953

S.R.O. 1727.—It is hereby notified for general information that the Indian Air Lines Corporation, with the previous approval of the Central Government,

has determined that the fares and freight rates and other charges for or in respect of the carriage of passengers and goods on air transport services operated by it shall be the same as were levied in respect of such services immediately before the 1st day of August, 1953.

[No. 12-CAG(11)/53.]

SADASHIVA PRASAD,
Officer on Special Duty.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

MERCHANT SHIPPING

New Delhi, the 9th September 1953

S.R.O. 1728.—The following draft of certain rules which it is proposed to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 216A of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 (XXI of 1923), read with clause (o) of sub-section (1A) of that section, is published for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after 8th October, 1953.

Any objection or suggestion which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government.

RULES

1. **Short title.**—These Rules may be called the Indian Merchant Shipping (Pilot Ladders) Rules, 1953.

2. **Application of the Rules.**—These Rules shall apply to—

- (i) Indian ships of over 200 tons,
- (ii) other ships which are required to carry a pilot under section 31 of the Indian Ports Act, 1908 (XV of 1908), while they are in any port in India.

Provided that these Rules shall not apply to a ship by reason of her being within a port in India if she would not have been in any such port but for stress of weather or any other circumstance that neither the master nor the owner nor the charterer (if any) of the ship could have prevented or forestalled.

3. **Provision of Pilot Ladders.**—(1) Every pilot ladder shall be efficient for the purpose of enabling a pilot to embark and disembark safely from the ship and, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing provision, shall be of sufficient length to reach the water, when the ship is in an unloaded condition and has no list, from the deck on which it is intended that the pilot shall embark and disembark.

(2) A man-rope of not less than 2½ inches circumference shall be provided on each side of the ladder and the inboard end of the man-rope shall be firmly secured to the ship.

(3) Means shall be provided to enable the ladder to be used on each side of the ship and to enable the pilot to pass safely from the head of the ladder to the deck of the ship.

(4) A light shall be provided which will shine alongside the ship so as to illuminate the ladder effectively at night.

4. **Penalty.**—Whoever contravenes any provision of these rules shall be punishable with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees, and, when the breach is a continuing one, with a further fine which may extend to twenty rupees for every day or the first during which the breach continues.

[No. 51-MA(2)/53.]

S. K. GHOSH, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 10th September 1953

S.R.O. 1729.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 52 of the Delhi Road Transport Authority Act, 1950 (XIII of 1950), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the Delhi Road Transport Authority (Advisory

Council) Rules, 1951, published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport No. S.R.O. 1298, dated the 20th August, 1951, namely:—

After rule 4 of the said Rules the following rule shall be inserted, namely:—

"4-A. Disqualifications for being as or for being a Member of the Delhi Road Transport Authority Advisory Council.—A person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, or for being a member of the Delhi Road Transport Authority Advisory Council—

- (a) if he is of unsound mind and stands so declared by a competent court;
- (b) if he has been adjudged insolvent; or
- (c) if he has been convicted of an offence involving moral turpitude; or
- (d) if he has, directly or indirectly, any interest in any subsisting contract made with, or in any work being done for, the Authority except as a share-holder (other than a director or managing agent) in a public company as defined in section 2 of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 (VII of 1913), provided that where he is a share-holder, he shall disclose to the Central Government the nature and extent of shares held by him in such company; or
- (e) if he has any financial interest in any other road transport undertaking."

[No. 18-TAG(19)/53.]

T. S. PARASURAMAN, Dy. Secy.

PORTS

New Delhi, the 12th September 1953

S.R.O. 1730.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 35 of the India Ports Act, 1908 (XV of 1908), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport No. 14-P(35)/50, dated the 12th April, 1950, specifying the fees for services rendered at the Port of Kandla, namely:—

In the schedule to the said notification under the heading "F. Hire of Ports Craft" in Note 1, clauses (c) and (d) shall be omitted.

[No. 14-P(35)/50.]

C. PARTHASARATHY, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 10th September 1953

S.R.O. 1731.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the dispute between the Imperial Bank of India and its workmen.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

REFERENCE No. 3 of 1953

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Imperial Bank of India

AND

Its workmen.

APPEARANCES

Messrs. K. R. Gopivallabh Iyengar, V. L. Narasimhamoorthy and Srimathi Ratnabai Chittur, Advocates—*For the workman.*

Shri C. Doraiswamy, Solicitor for M/s. King & Partridge, Madras—*For the Imperial Bank of India.*

AWARD

By Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Order No. LR.100(20), dated 18th April 1953, the dispute between the Imperial Bank of India and its workmen on the question, "whether the dismissal from service of Shri S. K. Bheemasena Rao from the Bangalore City Branch of the Bank on or about 13th August 1949 was justified and if not, what relief should be granted to him," has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication.

2. On notices being issued, Shri S. K. Bheemasena Rao (the workman concerned) and the Imperial Bank of India Indian Staff Union, Madras Circle, filed their written statements in identical terms. They contended that Shri Rao had put in 7½ years service at Bangalore and Bangalore City branches of the Imperial Bank of India and was drawing a salary of Rs. 94 at the relevant time. On 18th July 1949 he was called upon by the Agent of the Bangalore City Branch to explain the omission on his part in not posting a cash credit voucher of Rs. 550 relating to the account of Messrs. Bata Shoe Co. Ltd., before effecting the transfer of the balance. Mr. Rao had, as usual and in conformity with the Bank's practice, after the closure of the cash transactions at 2 p.m. and after posting all cash vouchers, transferred the balance in the account of Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. by mail transfer to Calcutta Head Office, *bona fide* believing and satisfying himself that there were no more cash vouchers. He had completed the posting of vouchers making the tray empty, when at about 4-45 p.m., this solitary voucher appeared in his tray. He questioned the messenger who used to bring the vouchers to him, but he pleaded absolute ignorance. The Agent, instead of making an enquiry on the spot and finding out the truth as to where the fault lay, proceeded on the assumption that Mr. Rao was in the wrong, as he had already developed a sort of temperamental dislike towards him. (i.e. Mr. Rao). Because of this prejudice, the Agent thought it fit that a good opportunity was afforded to him for victimising Mr. Rao, as was apparent from the quick succession of events which followed this incident. An explanation was asked for from him and he handed over the explanation to the Agent at 11 a.m. on 19th July 1949. On the very day at 2 p.m. a warning memo. purporting to be under instructions from Head Office was given by the Agent to him. A second memo. was given to him on 30th July 1949 wherein an attempt was made to force resignation from him. This memo. contained an incorrect statement that two warnings had been given to him in writing whereas only one such warning had been given to him. It is further contended that Mr. Rao was not aware of the charges against him made in the Branch Inspection Report and the premature termination of his services even before the expiry of three months' period mentioned in the memo. was nothing but proof of high-handed victimisation. Mr. Rao was an elected representative of the Union from the Bangalore City centre. It was further alleged that subsequently the Agent appeared to have managed with the Committee of the Local Board to see to the dismissal of Mr. Rao's services which was nothing but vindictive victimisation, as he was neither given an opportunity to put up defence nor was any enquiry made as was incumbent under the rules. He was given a notice by the Agent terminating his services from 13th August 1949. His services were terminated unjustly and for no reasonable cause, as he was not guilty of any misconduct or dereliction of duty. It was therefore prayed that the order should be cancelled and he should be re-instated in the Bank's services with the payment of all back salary, allowances, bonus, etc.

3. In reply to this, the Imperial Bank filed its written statement, contending that Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services were properly dispensed with by order of the Madras Local Board from 13th August 1949 with tender of a month's salary in lieu of notice and that he could have no cause of complaint. It was further contended that the alleged industrial dispute arose before May 1950 when the Industrial Disputes Act was extended to the State of Mysore and hence the order of reference made by the Government is invalid and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to entertain this case or to adjudicate on it or to pass an award therein. The Bank admitted that Mr. Rao was a clerk in the Bangalore City Branch with 7½ years service and at the time of the termination of his services, he was in receipt of a salary of Rs. 94 per month plus dearness allowance of Rs. 35 per month. He was working as a Ledger Keeper of ledger containing the account of Bata Shoe Co. Ltd., the balance of which account, at the close of every Monday, was transferred to the Bank's Calcutta Office by Mail Transfer. It was a necessary protection and invariable practice of each ledger keeper that before making such a transfer, he was to check all the relevant vouchers and to post up the account. On 18th July 1949, the balance of this account was transferred before posting a cash voucher of Rs. 550. It was easy for Mr. Rao in a small branch like the Bangalore City Branch to ensure that all the relevant vouchers were posted in the account. In his

explanation given to the Agent of the Branch on 19th July 1949, Mr. Rao declared that it was not possible for him to go to each table and to ascertain what vouchers were given or being prepared, and that it was nowhere the practice. This explanation illustrated Mr. Rao's general attitude towards those who were in authority over him. He was given an opportunity about the end of July 1949 to resign from service, but he refused to do so. The Bank then decided to terminate his services. In doing so, his previous conduct and work were also taken into consideration. His behaviour prior thereto had been one of deliberate insubordination and had been adversely reported on by a former Agent of the Branch and in the result, he had been warned and again on 6th June 1949, by a Senior Inspecting Officer. A further illustration of his attitude was evidenced by his claiming allowance for 35½ hours overtime for the month of June 1949 when he had actually worked only 2½ hours overtime. The bank denied all other allegations made by Mr. Rao and contended that in the circumstances the termination of his services was neither arbitrary nor unfair nor without reasonable cause but was proper and justified and no case arose for his reinstatement. In any case, his claim to reinstatement in service was untenable in law.

4. It is an admitted fact that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was serving as a clerk in the Bangalore City branch of the Imperial Bank of India in 1949 and that on 13th August 1949, he was served with a notice, Ex. 23, terminating his services from that date. Along with the notice of termination, a payment order was given for the salary for the current month and a further month's salary in lieu of notice plus salary for the period of leave at his credit. It is this order which is challenged as being unjust, illegal, and without reasonable cause. On behalf of the Bank, it is urged that this order is perfectly valid. Two law points have also been raised on behalf of the Bank. The first is that the order of reference in the present case is invalid, because the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to the State of Mysore at the time when the above order was passed. The second point was that the present reference would be bad on principles of *Res Judicata*. It appears that the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, passed an order No. LR.2(273), dated 21st February 1950, referring several disputes between the Banks mentioned in Schedule I thereto and their employees in respect of matters mentioned in Schedule II of that order, for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta (hereafter referred to as Calcutta Tribunal). The above order was published at page 815 of the Gazette of India, a copy of which has been produced in this case at exhibit 31. It shows that the Imperial Bank of India was one of the Banks referred to in Schedule I, and that one of the points mentioned in Schedule II was "retrenchment, discharge, or dismissal of workmen after 13th June 1949 (specific cases to be cited by the employees)". On receipt of this reference, the Calcutta Tribunal issued notices to the parties, a copy of which is produced in this case as Exhibit 32. In reply to this notice, the Imperial Bank of India Indian Staff Union wrote a letter (Exhibit 33) on 10th March 1950, to the Tribunal, forwarding a petition of Mr. Bheemasena Rao praying for reinstatement and consequent reliefs stating that his case was one of wrongful dismissal after 13th June 1949. Exhibit 34 is a copy of the statement of claim made in this connection. It may be noticed that this statement of claim is also in identical terms with the written statements filed by Mr. Bheemasena Rao and the Union before this Tribunal. The above matter was heard by the Calcutta Tribunal who held that it had no jurisdiction, because at the time when the reference was made to it, the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to the Mysore State. It therefore held that the claim of Mr. Bheemasena Rao must fail on this objection and the claim was therefore disallowed. It is because of this that the Bank urged that the present reference was bad on principles of *Res Judicata*.

5. The Industrial Disputes Act 1947 was passed on 11th March 1947 and came into force on 1st April 1947. Section 1(2) of the Act as originally enacted laid down that the Act extended to the whole of British India. By the Indian Independence (Adaptation of Central Government Acts and Ordinances) Order 1948, the words the "whole of British India" were substituted by the words "all provinces in India". The Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act 1950 was enacted on 20th May 1950. Section 34 thereof laid down that the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 was to be amended in the manner specified in the schedule thereto. The schedule read as under:—

"For sub-section (2) of Section 1, the following sub-section shall be substituted namely:—

(2) It extends to the whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir."

It would thus appear that till 20th May 1950, the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 was not applicable to Mysore State which is a part B State. The contention of the Bank is that in the present case the dispute, if any, arose on 13th August 1949

on which date Mr. Bheemasena Rao was given a notice of termination of his services and on that date, the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to Mysore State. It was made applicable only on 20th May 1950 and being not retrospective, it could not apply to a dispute which had arisen before that date (on 13th August 1949). It was further argued that on 13th August 1949, the parties were governed by ordinary common law of Master and Servant and the Bank was justified in terminating the services of its servants without giving any reasons for it on giving a reasonable notice. It was further argued that giving of a charge-sheet, holding of an enquiry etc. are concepts which have been developed after coming into force of the Industrial Disputes Act as a result of the decisions of different tribunals. On these grounds, it was urged that the reference was invalid and this Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain it. I am unable to accept these contentions.

6. It is true that on the day on which Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services were terminated, the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to the Mysore State and that it became applicable on 20th May 1950. This however would not mean that the Government had no power to make a reference to the Tribunal in respect of disputes which had arisen before 20th May 1950. The Government's power of making a reference is laid down in Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Sub-Section (1) thereof lays down that where the appropriate Government is of opinion that any industrial disputes exists or is apprehended, it may at any time refer the dispute or any matter appearing to be connected with or relevant to the dispute, to a Tribunal for adjudication. Thus what the section requires is that the Government must be of opinion that an industrial dispute *was in existence or was apprehended*. It does not mention that the Industrial dispute must arise after the Act comes into force. An industrial dispute may have arisen before the Act was passed or before it was applied to a particular State. The question of importance is whether at the time when the Act was passed or was made applicable, there was an existence of an industrial dispute or not. I would distinguish the word "exists" from the word "arises". The dispute may have arisen in 1949 but if it continued to exist and was in existence on 20th May 1950, on which date the Act became applicable to Mysore State, it would give the Government a power to refer it for adjudication to a Tribunal. I do not therefore agree with the contention raised on behalf of the Bank that as the dispute has arisen before the Industrial Disputes Act was made applicable to the Mysore State, it could not be referred for adjudication.

7. It was then contended that at the time when the order of termination of service of Mr. Bheemasena Rao was passed by the Bank, the parties were governed by the ordinary common law of Master and Servant and the subsequent applicability of the Act should not impose on the Bank an obligation of satisfying the Tribunal that what it did was according to the law. The Industrial Disputes Act is mainly a procedural law, so far as it empowers Government to constitute Industrial Tribunals, and refer industrial disputes for adjudication to the Tribunals. It lays down machinery for the quick investigation and settlement of industrial disputes. Mr. Bheemasena Rao may have a right under common law to file a suit for damages and that right is not in any way affected by the Industrial Disputes Act. That Act empowers Government to refer a dispute between an employer and its workman which may be an industrial dispute for adjudication to a Tribunal constituted thereunder. It thus provides for machinery for settlement of disputes and speedy adjudication of industrial disputes.

8. I do not agree with the contention raised on behalf of the Bank that the giving of a charge-sheet or holding an enquiry are concepts which have developed after coming into force of the Industrial Disputes Act. It is a well-known principle of common law that a person cannot be condemned unheard and before dismissing a person on the ground of misconduct, the employer must give an opportunity to the employee of defending himself and an employer must hold an enquiry before holding that the employee was guilty of that particular misconduct. If, for instance, Mr. Bheemasena Rao had filed a suit in the Civil Court against the Bank for damages for wrongful dismissal or the like, the Civil Court would have also enquired as to whether the Bank had given an opportunity to Mr. Bheemasena Rao to defend himself and whether it had held an enquiry before holding him guilty of misconduct. Giving of a charge-sheet and holding of an enquiry are not new developments of law but have been in existence all along. Probably before the passing of the Industrial Disputes Act, very few individual workmen went to the Civil Courts for redressing their grievances against the employers. With the passing of the Act, the employees as a whole can move the Government for adjudication of an industrial dispute and that is why we now find that the above principles are coming into prominence. It however does not mean that the Industrial Disputes Act has in any way changed the law on the

subject or that before that Act came into force, an employer was not bound to give a charge sheet or hold an enquiry etc. I do not agree with these contentions raised on behalf of the Bank.

9. The result is that in my opinion the present reference is perfectly valid though it refers to an industrial dispute which arose on 13th August 1949, i.e., at the time when the Industrial Disputes Act was not in force in Mysore State, as the dispute was in existence on 20th May 1950 when the Act was applied to the Mysore State. Before this date, the Government had passed an Order No. LR.2 (273), dated 21st February 1950, above referred to, and the Union had forwarded Mr. Rao's claim to the Tribunal on 10th March 1950. That dispute was thus pending for adjudication before the Calcutta Tribunal on 20th May 1950. Later on, it disallowed the claim on the ground that it had no jurisdiction; but the fact remains that on 20th May 1950, the present dispute was in existence.

10. The second contention that was raised on behalf of the Bank at the time of hearing was that the present reference was barred under the principles of *Res Judicata*. Though this point was not raised earlier, it could be raised at this stage, as it was a point of law. It was urged that this identical dispute was heard by the Calcutta Tribunal, which gave an award rejecting Mr. Bheemasena Rao's claim. This award has been published in the Gazette of India of 5th May 1951, in Part II, Section 3, at page 651, which has been produced in this case as Exhibit 27. I am unable to accept this contention also. The claim of Mr. Bheemasena Rao was disallowed by the Calcutta Tribunal on the legal objection that at the time when the reference was made to it, the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to Mysore State. As I stated above, the order of reference Exhibit 31 made in that case was made on 21st February 1950. As pointed out by me, the Industrial Disputes Act became applicable to Mysore State only on 20th May 1950 when Section 1(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act was amended by Section 34 of Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act 1950. It appears from the Calcutta Tribunal's award that it was argued before it that the Industrial Disputes Act must be deemed to have been applied to the Mysore State because of the Adaptation of Laws Order, dated 26th January 1950 and this argument was not accepted by that Tribunal. The above decision of the Tribunal only held that the Industrial Disputes Act was not applicable to the Mysore State on 21st February 1950 when the reference was made in that case. It cannot operate as *Res Judicata* in the case of a reference which has been made after 20th May 1950, when the Act admittedly became applicable to the Mysore State. I therefore hold that the present reference is not barred by principles of *Res Judicata*.

11. Coming now to the merits of the case, the allegation of the Union is that Mr. Bheemasena Rao's dismissal was unjust and was without reasonable cause and he should be reinstated. It was urged that no charge-sheet was served on him and he was not given an opportunity to defend himself nor was any enquiry held before dismissing him. On the other hand, the Bank's case is that they had not dismissed him but only terminated his services. They draw a distinction between dismissal and termination of services. They contend that a dismissal would be for misconduct and in that case, a charge sheet and enquiry may be necessary; but termination of services did not require a charge-sheet or an enquiry and that a master had every right to terminate the services of an employee without assigning any reasons and all that was necessary was giving of a reasonable notice. In this connection, the workman urge that the termination of services was only a camouflage for dismissal.

12. Exhibit 23 is the letter written by the Agent to Mr. Bheemasena Rao on 13th August 1949 informing him that the Local Board of the Bank had resolved that Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services should be terminated and his services would not be required by the Bank with effect from that date. A payment order representing his salary for the current month and a further month's salary in lieu of notice plus the salary for the leave at his credit was enclosed with this order. Prior to this, there had been an incident between Mr. Bheemasena Rao and the Agent of the Bank on 18th July 1949. For this, his explanation was asked for under the letter Exhibit 19 and he gave his explanation Exhibit 20. He had also been warned in connection with the branch inspection of the Branch and later on under the letter Exhibit 22, dated 30th July 1949, he was required to submit his resignation. On his not doing so, the above order terminating his services was passed.

13. There cannot be any doubt that there is a distinction between termination of service on giving notice and dismissal for misconduct. In the case of dismissal for misconduct, the employer is bound to serve a charge-sheet on the employee requiring explanation and giving him an opportunity to defend himself. The

employer is also bound to hold an enquiry before holding the charge proved. In the case of termination of services on giving of a notice, it would not always be necessary to give a charge sheet or to hold an enquiry. Usually the standing orders of different companies provide for terminating the service of an employee by discharging him on giving him a notice or paying him wages in lieu of notice without assigning any reason and they also provide for dismissal for misconduct. As observed by the Labour Appellate Tribunal of India in the well known case of Buckingham and Carnatic Mills Ltd. reported at 1951, Vol. II, L.L.J. page 314 (in para. 8), the requirements of *bona fides* would be essential in all cases. The termination of services in colourable exercise of the powers of an employee or as a result of victimisation or unfair labour practice or of caprice should be prevented, as otherwise some of the fundamental rights and principles would be violated. In para. 9 of the above judgment, the Labour Appellate Tribunal has observed that even when an employee was discharged on notice without assigning of a reason, the Tribunal would be at liberty to examine the explanation offered by the employee and other circumstances for the purpose of seeing whether the employer acted with an honest purpose. But in that case, no charge-sheet or enquiry would be necessary. In the case of dismissal for misconduct, certain rules of procedure would have to be followed. The reason for the distinction is apparent. In the case of a dismissal for misconduct, the man leaves the service with a bad name and principles of equity require that he should not be condemned unheard. Further, he would not be entitled to any notice or pay in lieu of notice. In the case of termination of services or discharge on giving notice, he leaves the employment without any blemish on his character and he is given a reasonable time to search for a job elsewhere. In such a case, therefore, it would not be necessary to hold an enquiry, because he is not being discharged for a specific misconduct.

14. I am aware that in the case between the Banks in the State of Madras and their workmen, reported at 1950, Vol. I, L.L.J., page 953, the All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), observed that when serious steps such as dismissal or discharge from service are taken against an employee, natural justice required that he should be told what the allegations against him are and he should be given an opportunity to explain them. The Tribunal have also condemned the practice of sending away an employee on only giving him one month's wages in lieu of notice. With all respect, I think that a distinction must be made between the case of dismissal for misconduct and a discharge on giving notice. The second All India Industrial Tribunal (Bank Disputes), in their award (Sastry Award) published in the Gazette of India, dated 20th April 1953 at page 1171 of Part II, Section III have also made this distinction between dismissal for misconduct and termination of services on giving notice. Chapter XXV, Section III at page 1312 and Section IV at page 1315 deal with this. Section III deals with the procedure for taking disciplinary action. Section IV deals with procedure for termination of an employment. Para. 522 contains the directions for termination of employment. In sub para. (1), it is laid down that in a case not involving disciplinary action for misconduct, the employment of a permanent employee may be terminated by three months' notice or on payment of three months' pay and allowances in lieu of notice. Where, however, disciplinary action for misconduct has to be taken, the procedure laid down in Section III paras. 520-521 would have to be followed. In other words, when a Bank does not dismiss a workman for misconduct but merely terminates his services on giving him notice or payment in lieu of notice, it is not necessary that he should be given reasons or that it should hold an enquiry into the matter.

15. In the case between Shri L. C. Seth and United Commercial Bank Ltd. reported at 1953, Vol. I, L.L.J. page 266, the Labour Appellate Tribunal has observed that it is a matter for serious consideration whether it would be open to an employer to avoid framing of a charge and take recourse to other easy expedients for the termination of services by following a procedure which would have the effect of robbing a workman of his explanation which he could have offered if a charge had been framed and by avoiding an enquiry into the charges which is obligatory on the part of the management where an employee has been charged for misconduct. The Appellate Tribunal however reserved their final opinion on this point. In the case of Bihar Fire Works and Pottery Workers Union reported at 1953, Vol. I, L.L.J. page 49, the Labour Appellate Tribunal of India made a distinction between the case of a dismissal and a discharge, when employee was dismissed without notice on the ground that the employer had lost confidence in him.

16. In my opinion, at the time when Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services were terminated by the Bank on giving him notice, they were not bound to give reasons for the

same or to hold an enquiry in the matter. In the circumstances, I think that the claim that Mr. Bheemasena Rao should be reinstated cannot be accepted.

17. Assuming however, that the Bank was bound to serve a charge-sheet on Mr. Bheemasena Rao and hold an enquiry before terminating his services, the mere fact that it did not do so would not be sufficient to order reinstatement of Mr. Bheemasena Rao. Even when an employee is dismissed without an enquiry for alleged misconduct, the dismissal would not *per se* be illegal; but the Tribunal would be entitled to go into the merits of the case and see whether on facts the dismissal was justified. Hence even if it be held that the Bank should have served a charge-sheet on Mr. Bheemasena Rao and held an enquiry and the Bank did not do so, the Tribunal would in that case have to go into the merits of the case and see whether the termination of Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services by the Bank was justified or not.

18. It is an admitted fact that on 18th July 1949 Mr. Bheemasena Rao was working as ledger keeper. The ledger containing the account of Messrs. Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. was in his charge. The balance of this account, at the close of every Monday, was to be transferred to the Bank's Calcutta Office by mail transfer. 18th July 1949 was a Monday and it is an admitted fact that Mr. Bheemasena Rao closed the account of the Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. on that day without posting a voucher of Rs. 550 in the ledger before transferring the balance to the head office. His case is that he did this by 3 P.M. whereas the cash voucher in question was found by him in his tray at 4-45 P.M. and before this the tray was empty. In his written statement in para. 6, he has said that "that the petitioner, as it subsequently turned out to be, found that there was a hidden hand at play apparently to trap him and book him and the messenger who used to bring the vouchers from counters and officers when questioned by the petitioner as to how it was that the particular voucher in reference came to be found in the petitioner's tray at 4-45 P.M. betrayed absolute ignorance". No attempt has been made by him to substantiate this allegation. He has not suggested as to what hidden hand was at play to trap him or to book him, nor has he alleged as to why this voucher should not have been given to him earlier. In my opinion, this allegation has been made by him only to escape the consequences of his negligence in not posting the voucher, as he should have done before closing the account and transferring the balance to the Calcutta Head Office. He was called by the Agent and asked about this. The then Agent Mr. Annaswamy's evidence is Exhibit 13 in this case. He has stated that he called Mr. Bheemasena Rao and asked him as to why he had not posted the voucher before effecting the transfer and he replied that it was not his duty to go and search for vouchers and his duty was only confined to those vouchers which were brought over to him. Mr. Annaswamy told him that it was absurd to tell like that that the vouchers which were only brought to him would be posted, because in that case he would not be able to transfer the correct amount. Mr. Bheemasena Rao repeated the same reply and added that he was not responsible for it. On some discussion with him on the futility of the argument, Mr. Annaswamy sent for the Accountant and told him to make Mr. Bheemasena Rao understand that he was adopting a recalcitrant attitude and that was not proper on his part. Thereupon Mr. Bheemasena Rao became very insolent and Mr. Annaswamy called upon him to give his explanation in writing. Mr. Bheemasena Rao further showed signs of disrespect and said that if he had to give in writing, then Mr. Annaswamy should also give in writing. Accordingly a memo. was given to him. This memo. is Exhibit 19 in this case and therein the Agent asked Mr. Bheemasena Rao to explain why he did not correctly ascertain that all the vouchers of the day had been posted into the account of Messrs. Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. before transferring the balance to Calcutta. The memo. further mentioned that a cash credit voucher for Rs. 550 was found unposted after the transfer was effected and that is why the explanation was required. Lastly the memo. stated that if it was the view of Mr. Bheemasena Rao as verbally stated by him to the Agent that he would not post vouchers unless brought to him by the messenger and that in the case of the above nature it would not be his duty to ensure that all credit vouchers had been posted, he should state so in writing. Mr. Bheemasena Rao's explanation to this memo. is Exhibit 20. Therein he has mentioned that as usual after closure of cash at 2 P.M. and after posting all the cash vouchers concerning his ledger, he transferred the balance in the account of the Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. by mail transfer. It further mentioned that the voucher under reference was found in his empty tray at 4-45 P.M. and when he asked the peon where the voucher was, he said that he did not know. He further said that it was strange to expect a cash voucher at 4-45 P.M. at which time the office was due to be closed. He was neither responsible for the omission nor was it possible for him to go to each table and ascertain what vouchers were coming or being prepared and it was nowhere the practice. Further Mr. Bheemasena Rao in this letter denied the imputation made in the latter part of the memo. Exhibit 19 as utterly false and distorted. He

mentioned that it was only when Mr. Annaswamy told him to go to each table and ascertain what vouchers were coming, he expressed that it was a novel suggestion which was nowhere in practice and that he suggested that the supervising officers pass the vouchers to the peons concerned, who distribute them to the clerks concerned. In his deposition before the Tribunal, Mr. Bheemasena Rao, Exhibit 29, has made a statement that he was heavily worked and because of the heavy work, it was not possible for him to go to every table to verify whether all cash vouchers had been sent to him for being posted in the ledgers. This allegation that it was because of heavy work that it was not possible for him to do this has been made by him for the first time in his deposition before the Tribunal. Neither in the explanation Exhibit 20 above referred to nor in his statement before the Calcutta Tribunal nor in his statement before this Tribunal has he stated that he was heavily worked or that because of the heavy work, it was not possible for him to go to every table to verify whether all cash vouchers had been sent to him for being posted in the ledgers. He has admitted that as a ledger clerk, he was doing the same work which was being done by his predecessor and nothing more or nothing less. He has further said that whenever he may have been on leave, some other clerk would be acting in his place and would be doing all the work that was being done by him. Thus the allegation that he was heavily worked does not therefore appear to be correct, and the explanation that because of the heavy work it was not possible for him to go to every table to verify whether all cash vouchers had been sent to him for being posted in the ledger cannot be accepted as correct. In his cross-examination, he had to admit that before closing the account of a constituent whose balance had to be transferred to the Head Office, the ledger keeper must go to the Sub-Accountant, and ask him whether any vouchers of that constituent remained to be posted. He further said that on 18th July 1949 also, he had gone to the Sub-Accountant at 3-30 P.M. and asked him whether there were any vouchers of Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. and he was told that there was no such voucher and after this, he closed the account of the Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. This allegation about his having gone to the Sub-Accountant and inquiring from him whether there was any voucher of Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. has been made by him in his deposition only after he was forced to admit that it was the duty of a ledger keeper to go to the Sub-Accountant and make this inquiry. If he has actually gone to the Sub-Accountant and made the inquiry as alleged, he would have certainly mentioned this fact in his explanation Exhibit 20, and also in his written statement before the Calcutta Tribunal and in the written statement before this Tribunal. I do not believe his explanation when he says that he had gone to the Sub-Accountant on 18th July 1949 and inquired whether there were any vouchers of Messrs. Bata Shoe Co. Ltd. and in not doing so he had clearly failed in his duty.

19. The fact that some transfer vouchers were lying on the table of another clerk would be immaterial. There is a distinction between a cash voucher and a transfer voucher. Further as specifically admitted by Mr. Bheemasena Rao, before closing an account and transferring the balance to the Head Office, the ledger keeper must inquire whether any vouchers of that constituent remained to be posted and if without making the inquiry, he closed the account and transferred the balance, it would be no reply to say that some transfer vouchers were lying unposted at some other table. At any rate, even if some other clerk is found to be negligent, it would not exonerate Mr. Rao from blame, because by the negligence in not posting the above voucher, the Bank stood the risk of losing the amount of Rs. 550 and also stood the risk of losing its prestige in being negligent. Similarly, the fact that the Bank did not in this case actually lose any money would not make much difference. The point is whether because of the negligence of the clerk, the Bank was likely to lose the money. The amount involved in the particular case would not also make much difference. It may be small or large. A Bank, who has to deal with constituents having large and small balances cannot afford to keep a negligent clerk; because, sometimes, the amount may be a large one. Further, the constituent might feel that the Bank is not careful, and the Bank's prestige would suffer.

20. In para. 7 of the written statement, it has been alleged that the 'hen Agent (Mr. Annaswamy) proceeded on the assumption that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was in the wrong, as he (i.e. Mr. Annaswamy) had already developed a sort of temperamental dislike towards Mr. Rao. In para. 9 of the written statement, the last sentence reads, "that the petitioner was an elected representative of the Union from Bangalore City centre". In his deposition Exhibit 29, Mr. Bheemasena Rao has stated that as he was working as elected representative of the workmen's union, he suspected that action was taken against him because of that. It may be noted however that a specific allegation that action was taken against him because of his union activities has not been made by him at any time before his deposition. Though a sentence as pointed out above does appear in para. 9 of the written statement that

he was an elected representative of the union, it does not mention that because of his union activities, action was taken against him. Apart from this, I believe that there is no basis for holding that action was taken against him, because of his union activities nor is there any basis for holding that Mr. Annaswamy had developed a temperamental dislike for him.

21. Mr. Annaswamy's deposition is Exhibit 13. Not a single question has been put to him suggesting that he had developed a temperamental dislike towards Mr. Bheemasena Rao or that action was taken against Mr. Rao because of his Union activities or because of his being an elected representative of the Union. It may be noted that, as admitted by Mr. Bheemasena Rao, Mr. Annaswamy became the Agent of the Bangalore City Branch in the beginning of July 1949. The above incident occurred on 18th July 1949. In other words Mr. Annaswamy was the Agent of the Bangalore City Branch only for a few days before the incident. He could not have come in much personal contact with Mr. Bheemasena Rao so as to develop any temperamental dislike or prejudice against him. Mr. Bheemasena Rao's deposition shows that he had very rare occasions to come in personal contact with the Agent. Actually when Mr. Bheemasena Rao's attention was drawn to the allegation of temperamental dislike, he said that the Agent had already received the inspection report of the Branch Inspection carried out by the head office and that report contained some adverse remarks against him and because of this, the agent Mr. Annaswamy was prejudiced against him. Assuming that because of the adverse remarks made by the inspecting staff against Mr. Bheemasena Rao, the Agent got prejudiced against him, it could not be said that he had developed a "temperamental dislike" of Mr. Bheemasena Rao. That allegation cannot be thus believed. The allegation that Mr. Annaswamy was prejudiced against him because of adverse remarks made by the inspecting staff cannot be believed because there is nothing to show that these remarks were received by Mr. Annaswamy before 18th July 1949. No questions were put to Mr. Annaswamy on this point and this shows that these allegations could not be believed.

22. Regarding the allegation that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was victimised because of his union activities, I have already pointed out above, that he has not made these allegations specifically in his written statement. It may then be noted that all clerks of the Bangalore City Branch are members of the Union. It was said that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was the elected representative of the Bangalore City Branch. It may however be noted that he was not the only elected representative but one Mr. Naidu was another elected representative; that is, both of them were the elected representative of the Union from the Bangalore city from 1947 when the Union started working at Bangalore. Nothing happened to Mr. Rao all this time. So far as Mr. Naidu is concerned, not only is he still in the Bank's service; but he has been promoted as Head Clerk and that too, during the time Mr. Annaswamy was Agent of the Branch. It cannot be believed that action was taken against Mr. Bheemasena Rao, as he was an elected representative of the Union. It is easy to make an allegation of this type; but unless there is satisfactory proof, the allegation cannot be accepted as true; otherwise, no employer would be in a position to take disciplinary action against an union representative even if that representative may be in the wrong. Looking to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am satisfied that action was taken against Mr. Bheemasena Rao, not because he was an elected representative of the Union, but because of his misconduct during the time he was serving the Bank.

23. It was suggested that merely because a clerk omitted to post a voucher in the ledger, the action of termination of service would be a very severe action against him. As I pointed out earlier, an action of non-posting of voucher in a ledger before transferring the balance to the Head Office would amount to gross negligence and may lead the Bank to a financial loss and also the loss of prestige. I however do feel that the Bank authorities would probably not have taken this extreme action against Mr. Bheemasena Rao but for his past conduct. In his evidence Mr. Mundkur who was the agent of the Bangalore City Branch from 1945 to October 1947 has stated that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was deliberately slow in his work. The Head Clerk very frequently complained against him to the Agent. The Sub-Accountant also complained against him that he was rejecting the work allotted to him and was habitually insolent to the supervisory staff. He was in the habit of criticising the supervising staff, declaring that he would frustrate the working of the office. When he was asked to desist from behaving in this manner, he used towards the supervisory staff words like 'shut up', 'stupid' and such other phrases. Mr. Mundkur has also said that he had noticed that Mr. Bheemasena Rao delivered his work late and was also negligent. When Mr. Mundkur sat near him and asked him why he did not send the work, he was insolent and said that it was not his work but that

of the peons. When he became insolent towards him, he reported the matter to the Head Office and under instructions from the Head Office, a warning was issued to Mr. Bheemasena Rao. Exhibit 15 is a copy of this warning. Mr. Bheemasena Rao denies having received this warning. Mr. Mundkur who was then the Agent and who has signed it has stated that this warning was delivered personally by him to Mr. Bheemasena Rao. He is supported in his evidence by Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao (Exhibit 28) who was then working as a Head Clerk in the Bangalore City Branch and who has initialled the notice Exhibit 15 to show his approval thereof. He has also said that this notice was personally handed over by the Agent to Mr. Bheemasena Rao in his presence. It is true that it does not bear Mr. Bheemasena Rao's signature in testimony of the original having been delivered to him. Mr. Mundkur's explanation is that at the time, there was no practice of getting acknowledgments and that the practice was introduced later on. Mr. Ramachandra Rao has said that when the letter was delivered by the Agent personally, the signature of the clerk was not obtained. It does appear that subsequently when some letters were delivered by the Agent to Mr. Bheemasena Rao, his signatures were obtained but probably this was due to the fact that that practice was started later on. I see no reason to disbelieve responsible officers like Mr. Mundkur and Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao, who have no personal interest in the matter. Actually Mr. Bheemasena Rao has admitted in his deposition that except Mr. Annaswamy, no other Agent entertained any temperamental dislike towards him. He has also admitted that Mr. Ramachandra Rao had no prejudice or temperamental dislike against him. There is no reason why Mr. Mundkur or Mr. Ramachandra Rao should give false evidence against Mr. Bheemasena Rao. I believe them and hold that a warning Exhibit 15 was served on Mr. Bheemasena Rao in 1947.

24. Mr. Mundkur's evidence also shows that Mr. Bheemasena Rao's attitude towards his superiors was not proper. He was insolent towards them and was using bad language; he was also deliberately avoiding work. We have then the evidence of Mr. V. Ramachandra Rao Exhibit 14 and he has also stated that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was highly insubordinate, impertinent and of a rebellious nature. Whenever instructions were issued to him, he refused to do any reasonable work allotted to him in an emergency. On one occasion, he threatened him with dislocation in the office work. He was also negligent and slow in his work and used to read newspapers in the office and waste his time unnecessarily. Then we have Exhibit 25, a letter from a previous Agent of the Bank wherein he has also said that Mr. Bheemasena Rao's general conduct and behaviour were far from satisfactory and that he was generally inclined to shirk work and assume an attitude of insubordination. He also used to encourage indiscipline and obstructive tactics amongst other members of the staff. We then find that inspection of the Bangalore City Branch was carried out by the Head Office in about June 1949 and the inspecting staff reported against him. Exhibit 26 is an extract from the said report and it states that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was unreliable and unscrupulous and was inclined to cover his own delinquencies by imputing motives to others. As a result of this report, a warning Exhibit 21 was served on him under instructions from the Head Office. At about the time of this incident, Mr. Bheemasena Rao put in a claim for overtime work for 35½ hours work said to have been done by him in the month of June 1949. (see his letter Exhibit 16). The agent referred the matter to the Head Office by the letter Exhibit 17, stating that Mr. Rao was really entitled to only 2½ hours overtime allowance. The Head Office by letter Exhibit 18 upheld the Agent's view and held that Mr. Bheemasena Rao was entitled to overtime allowance for 2½ hours only. (see letter Exhibit 18). This would show that Mr. Bheemasena Rao grossly exaggerated his claim for overtime.

25. If, taking all this conduct on the part of Mr. Bheemasena Rao, the Bank decided to terminate his services, it could not be said that their action was harsh or severe. An employer is entitled to insist on the employees being disciplined and if any employee is habitually insolent and is found to be deliberately negligent and slow and trying to exaggerate his claims for overtime payment and if the employer also finds that he was negligent in his duty which negligence might have put the employer to a financial loss and loss of prestige, the employer would, in my opinion, be entitled to terminate the services of that employee.

26. In this connection, it was argued on behalf of Mr. Bheemasena Rao that he was regularly given his increments and this shows that his conduct was satisfactory. I do not agree with this. An increment in the time scale of pay is usually granted as a matter of course. His superiors may not have thought fit at the time to stop his increments; but when things went from bad to worse and when it was found that the different Agents had reported adversely against him and they all had found him insolent, shirker of work and unreliable, his last action about the negligence in not posting the cash voucher was probably the last straw that broke the camel's neck.

27. After having given my careful consideration to all the facts and circumstances of the case, I am satisfied that the termination of services of Mr. Bheemasena Rao was proper and that he is not entitled to reinstatement or back wages. In this connection, I may also mention that even if I had held that the charge of negligence in not posting the cash voucher was not proved, I would not have ordered his reinstatement, looking to his past conduct because that would have made discipline in the Bank suffer. It may also be noted that soon after the Bank terminated his services, Mr. Rao has obtained another job with a higher salary. For over four years, he is not in Bank's service, and this would also be a factor for not reinstating him. I would however have awarded compensation to him at the rate of 15 days pay for every year of service. As it is, however, the question does not arise because the termination of his services are held to be proper by me.

28. There is however one point on which I think the Bank's order is not proper, and it is that they have given him one month's notice. Even under the Sastry award above referred to, the services of a permanent employee can be terminated by discharge by giving him three months' notice. In my opinion, Mr. Bheemasena Rao was entitled to notice pay for three months and not for one month as offered to him by the Bank. The Bank should therefore pay him three months' pay as notice pay.

In the result, I pass the following award:—

AWARD

The termination of Mr. Bheemasena Rao's services from the Bangalore City Branch of the Imperial Bank of India from 13th August 1949 is held to be justified and proper. He is however entitled to salary including dearness allowance for the whole of August 1949 and in addition he is entitled to three months' salary including dearness allowance in lieu of notice. He is further entitled to salary including dearness allowance for one month and nine days for leave which was due to him credit. The whole amount so due to him, less the amount, if any, which may have been paid to him towards this, should be paid to him within one month from the date this award becomes enforceable.

The 31st August 1953.

L. P. DAVE, Chairman.

[No. LR-100(20).]

N. C. KUPPUSWAMI, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 15th September 1953

S.R.O. 1732.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 83 of the Mines Act, 1952 (XXXV of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. LP-155(17), dated the 12th July 1949, the Central Government hereby exempts the mines, groups of mines, classes of mines, parts of mines, and classes of persons specified in the first column of the Schedule hereto annexed from the operation of those provisions of the said Act which are specified in the corresponding entry in the second column thereof, subject to the conditions, if any, specified in the corresponding entry in the third column thereof.

SCHEDULE

Mines and classes exempted	Provisions from which exemption is granted	Conditions attached to exemption
1	2	3
<p>1. Mines of kankar, murum, laterite, gravel, sand, clay (not including kaolin, china clay or white clay), fireclay, ochre, stone, earth, fuller's earth, barytes, bauxite, slate and lime-stone : Provided that this exemption shall not apply to—</p> <p>(a) The mines specified in Appendix I to this Schedule.</p> <p>(b) Slate mines in the State of the East Punjab and in the Monghyr district of the State of Bihar.</p>	<p>All excepting the provisions contained in sections 44, 45 and 46.</p>	<p>(1) The owner, agent or manager of every mine so exempted, whether existing or new shall forward to the Chief Inspector and the District Magistrate a report in the form contained in Appendix II to this Schedule as soon as—</p> <p>(i) the depth of the mine measured from its highest to its lowest point reaches 20 feet ; or</p> <p>(ii) the number of persons employed in the mine on any day is more than 50 ; and at such times thereafter as the District Magistrate may direct.</p>

1

2

3

- (c) Limestone mines in the districts of Shahabad and Jubbulpore.
- (d) Mines of soapstone or steatite.
- (e) Stone mines in the Town and Island of Bombay.
- (f) Any mine in which working extend below ground.

(2) The owner, agent, and manager shall permit the Chief Inspector or any person exercising the powers of an Inspector or a person duly authorised in writing in this behalf by a person exercising the powers of an Inspector to enter, inspect and examine any mine so exempted at any reasonable time.

2. Borings and oil wells in the making or operation of which no person is employed beneath the adjacent ground level. All.

Mines or parts of mines in which excavation is being carried out for prospecting purposes only and not for the purpose of obtaining minerals for use or sale : All.

Provided that—

- (i) not more than 20 persons are employed in or about such excavation ;
- (ii) no part of the excavation extends beneath the adjacent ground level ; and
- (iii) the depth of the excavation measured from its highest to its lowest point nowhere exceeds 20 feet or, in the case of an excavation for coal, 50 feet.

4. Iron-ore mines worked without mechanical power, the whole of the ore from which is supplied locally to village smelters and blacksmiths. All excepting the provisions contained in Sections 44, 45 and 46. The owner, agent or manager of any mine so exempted shall not permit any female to enter for purposes of employment, or be employed in, the under-ground workings, if any, of the mine.

5. The following mines in the State of Bihar, namely : All.

- (i) The coke factory of the Burrakur Coal Company, Ltd., at Loyabad in the Manbhum district.
- (ii) The coke factory of the Barari Coke Company Ltd., at Kendwadih in the Manbhum district. All
- (iii) The coke factory of the Eastern Coal Company, Ltd., at Bhowra in the Manbhum district. All.

1	2	3
(iv) The coke factory of the Lodna Colliery Company, Ltd., at Lodna in the Manbhum district.	All.	
(v) The coke factory of the Eastern Railway at Girdih in the Hazaribagh district.	All.	
6. The following mines in the State of Bombay, namely:— Stone crushing plants forming part of the mines included in Appendix I or situated in the Town and Island of Bombay.	All.	
7. The following mines in the State of Delhi, namely:— Stone mines Nos. 2 to 15 in the Delhi District specified in Appendix I.	The provisions contained in sections 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 44 and 48.	
8. The following mines in the State of Madras, namely:— Stone mines in the Mangalgi sub-division of the Guntur district specified in Appendix I.	The provisions contained in Section 48.	
9. Persons employed in the loading of wagons, tubs or carts on the surface and cartmen on the surface.	The provisions contained in Sections 36 and 48 (1) (d).	
10. Firemen, winding enginemen, pumpmen and horse-keepers.	The provisions of Section 28.	
11. Winding enginemen, Engine and Powerhouse attendants, Banksmen, Boiler Firemen, Trolley-men and Frammers. Persons working on mechanical screening and loading Plants; and Fan attendants.	The provisions contained in Sections 30 (2) and 48 (2).	(1) The period of work of these workers shall not exceed eight hours in any day. (2) The entries in the register prescribed by section 48 (1) shall be such that workers working in accordance therewith are not working in contravention of any of the provisions in Chapter VI of the Act other than those from which exemption is given, or in contravention of condition (1).

APPENDIX I

[See Clause (a) of proviso to entry I in first column of Schedule.]

Serial No.	Name of mine	Name of owner	Situation		
			Village	Sub-division	District
1	2	3	4	5	6
WEST BENGAL					
Stone Mines					
1	Maharaja's stone	Maharaja of Kassimbazar.	Bahadurpur Chandannagar Lakshmanpur.	Rampurhat	Birbhum.
2	Gopalpur	S. G. Bose	Rajagaon	Do.	Do.
3	Sundarpahari	D. R. Kapur	Sundarpahari	Asansol	Burdwan.

1	2	3	4	5	6
<i>Clay Mines</i>					
1	Gopinathpur	Nirode Baran Roy	Durgapur	Asansol	Burdwan.
2	Ranigunj No. 1	Burn and Company, Limited.	Ronai	Do.	Do.
3	Ranigunj No. 2	Ditto	Bakrarnagar	Do.	Do.
4	Ranigunj No. 3	Ditto	Ronai	Do.	Do.
3	Ranigunj Clay No. 6.	Ditto	Bansara	Do.	Do.
<i>Fireclay Mines</i>					
1	Churulia	The Churulia Coal Co., Ltd.	Churulia	Asansol	Burdwan.
2	Danapahari	Danapahari Fire-clay Concern	Bonjamuri	Do.	Do.
3	Dendua	D. N. Chowdhury	Dendua	Do.	Do.
4	Dabor	Ditto	Dabor	Do.	Do.
5	Sabanpur	Burn and Company, Limited.	Sabanpur	Do.	Do.
6	Sangramgarh	Kalyanji Lalji	Sangramgarh	Do.	Do.
7	Ranganakali	Someswar Ojha	Ranganakali	Do.	Do.
8	Lalbazar	Mandal, Khandait and Company.	Lalbazar	Do.	Do.
9	Pahargora	Ditto	Pahargora	Do.	Do.
10	Digari	Burn and Company, Limited.	Digari	Do.	Do.
11	Bhadulia	D. N. Roy and others	Bhadulia	Suri	Birbhum.
12	Rassa	Ditto	...	Do.	Do.
13	Barhra	Ditto	Barhra	Do.	Do.
14	Salanpur	D. N. Chowdhury	Salanpur	Asansol	Burdwan.
15	Sirishkanali	Ditto	Sirishkanali	Do.	Do.
16	Mohanpur	B. N. Roy	Mohanpur	Do.	Do.
17	Dasarmohan	D. N. Chowdhury	Dasarmohan	Do.	Do.
18	Lawhat	Durga Prashad Asthana and Krishan Prashad Asthana.	Lawhat	Do.	Do.
19	Jamgram	G. T. Pandit	Jamgram	Do.	Do.
20	Chinchurbil	Churlia Sadhu's Estate Ltd.	Chinchurbil	Do.	Do.
21	Sarisatli	S. D. Paul	Rasunpur	Do.	Do.
22	Mohanpur	Bholanath Roy	Mohanpur	Do.	Do.
23	Kalyanpur	Burn and Company Limited.	Kalanpur	Do.	Do.
24	Sangramgarh	Madan Lal Marwari	Sangramgarh	Do.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BIHAR					
<i>Stone Mines</i>					
1	Kendadih . . .	Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited.	Galudih	Singhbhum.
2	Bhairabpur Quarry No. 2.	A. N. Mukherjee . . .	Bhairabpur . . .	Jamshedpur	Do.
3	Bhairabpur . . .	L. Hartley and Company.	Narsingarh . . .	Do. . .	Do.
4	Pawrah Narsingarh	K. B. Dass . . .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
5	Dhaodandh . . .	Government of Bihar P. W. Department (Irrigation Branch.)	Daodandh . . .	Sasaram . . .	Shahabad.
6	Barhaibagh . . .	East Indian Railway	Barhaibagh . . .	Do.	Do.
7	Tarachandi . . .	Seth Isar Das . . .	Tarachandi (Sikaria.)	Do. . .	Do.
8	Araji-Khaprajola and Kolhajora.	Seth Lilaram . . .	Araji-Khaprajola and Kolhajora.	Pakur . . .	Sonthal Parganas.
9	Baghajuli and Monjurcola.	J. N. Banerjee and Company.	Baghajuli . . .	Do. . .	Do.
10	Baghajuli . . .	Eastern Stone Company.	Baghajuli . . .	Do. . .	Do.
11	Baghajuli . . .	K. D. Gupta . . .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
12	Baghajuli and Ghorapahari.	H. K. Mukherjee . . .	Baghajuli and Ghorapahari.	Do. . .	Do.
13	Baghajuli . . .	Pakurjam Stone Company.	Baghajuli . . .	Do. . .	Do.
14	Baghajuli and Monjurcola.	Raghubir Prasad and Bros.	Baghajuli and Monjurcola.	Do. . .	Do.
15	Baghajuli . . .	Maharaja of Kassimbazar Stone Works.	Baghajuli . . .	Do. . .	Do.
16	Baghajuli . . .	A. Sarkar & Co. . .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
17	Ghorapahari . . .	All India Stone Co.	Ghorapahari . . .	Do. . .	Do.
18	Ghorapahari . . .	Pakur Stone Supply Co.	Ghorapahari . . .	Do. . .	Do.
19	Ghorapahari . . .	Cunliffe and Martin	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
20	Baghajuli . . .	Laljiram Raghu-nandan Prasad.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
21	Ghorapahari . . .	Pakur Stone Co. . .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
22	Ghorapahari . . .	Pakurjam Stone Co.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
23	Ghorapahari . . .	Raghubir Prasad and Bros.	Ghorapahari . . .	Do. . .	Do.
24	Ghorapahari . . .	Seth Theomall . . .	Ghorapahari . . .	Do. . .	Do.
25	Jharnatola . . .	H. K. Mukherjee . . .	Jharnatola . . .	Do. . .	Do.
26	Kolajora . . .	Ditto . . .	Kolarjorah . . .	Do. . .	Do.
27	Mahulan . . .	Kumar G. C. Pande	Mahula . . .	Do. . .	Do.
28	Mahadebpur . . .	H. K. Mukherjee . . .	Mahadebpur . . .	Do. . .	Do.
29	Malpahari . . .	B. N. Paul and M. N. Day.	Malpahari . . .	Do. . .	Do.
30	Malpahari . . .	Bchar Stone and Supply Company.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
31	Malpahari . . .	Gyanendra Nath Banerjee.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
32	Malpahari . . .	B. B. Chatterjee & Sons.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

BIHAR—contd.

Stone Mines—contd.

33	Malpahari . . .	Chatterjee Shaw & Company.	Malpahari . . .	Pakur . . .	Sonthal Parganas.
34	Malpahari . . .	K. C. Ghosh & Co.	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
35	Malpahari . . .	H. K. Mukherjee . .	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
36	Malpahari . . .	Netram Sagarmall . .	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
37	Malpahari . . .	Pakur Stone Co. . .	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
38	Mungalpara . . .	Ditto . . .	Mngalpara . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
39	Manjurcola . . .	B. B. Chatterjee and Sons.	Manjurcola . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
40	Manjurcola . . .	Chatterjee Chakravarty	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
41	Manjurcola . . .	Netram Sagarmall . .	Do. . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
42	Baghajuli and Manjurcola	Seth Khia Mall . .	Baghajuli and Manjurcola.	Do. . . .	Do.
43	Matiara . . .	Netram Sagarmall . .	Matiara . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
44	Murgadanga . . .	Ramananda Raghu-nath Missir.	Murgadanga . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
45	Pathrapara . . .	H. K. Mukherjee . .	Pathrapara . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
46	Pipuljhuri . . .	Pakur Stone Co. . .	Pipuljhuri . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
47	Pipuljhuri and Arajikhaprajola.	Kumar G. C. Pandey	Pipuljhuri Arajikhaprajola.	Do. . . .	Do.
48	Ranicola . . .	H. K. Mukherjee . .	Ranicola . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
49	Sonajuri . . .	Ditto . . .	Sonajuri . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
50	Bankudih Chota Bonapara.	Gurudeo Singh . .	Bankudih . . .	Rajmahal . .	Do.
51	Bankudih . . .	Sha Muhammad Biswas.	Bankudih . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
52	Bindubasini hill	Calcutta Chord Railway Company.	Jhumarbaq . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
53	Bara Bonapara . .	Unsettled
54	Boghapahar . . .	Birendra Nath Sha .	Boghapahar . . .	Rajmahal . .	Sonthal Parganas.
55	Bornapahar . . .	Unsettled
56	Bara Betona . . .	Birendra Nath Sha .	Bara Betona . . .	Rajmahal . .	Sonthal Parganas.
57	Belbhadri . . .	Unsettled
58	Chalpahar Pakkatori Pahar.	E. B. Railway . .	Paktori Pahar . .	Rajmahal . .	Sonthal Parganas.
59	Chowki Pahar . .	A. S. Apar . . .	Chowki Pahar . .	Do. . . .	Do.
60	Gadaitongi . . .	Seth Sundar Prasad	Gadaitongi . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
61	Gumapahar . . .	Gurudeo Singh . .	Gumapahar . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
62	Gangu-para . . .	Keshab Chandra Banerjee.	Gangu-para . . .	Do. . . .	Do.
63	Madia . . .	Harinath Das . .	Madia . . .	Do. . . .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BIHAR— <i>contd.</i>					
<i>Stone Mines—contd.</i>					
64	Maharajpur Harinkole.	T. S. Samanta	Dudhkole .	Rajmahal.	Sonthal Parganas.
65	Malitoke . . .	E. B. Railway	Malitoke . . .	Do.* .	Do.
66	Pathria Balapokhar	J. N. Mukherjee .	Pathria Balapokhar	Do. .	Do.
67	Rangatola, Harinkole and Sarwapur.	K. K. Mukherjee Brothers	Rangatola Harinkole.	Do. .	Do.
68	Sahibganj Block No. I.	Birendra Nath Sha .	Motijharna .	Do. .	Do.
69	Sahibganj Block No. II.	J. N. Mukharji .	Bhagiamari .	Do. .	Do.
70	Sahibganj Block No. III.	Sital Prasad Marwari	Adro Bedo . .	Do.* .	Do.
71	Sahibganj Block No. IV.	Ditto . .	Golbandha . .	Do. .	Do.
72	Sitapahar Patnibona	Nanji Mowji . .	Sitapahar Patnibona	Do.* .	Do.
73	Sitapahar Melitoke	Sardar Kartar Singh	Malitoke . .	Do. .	Do.
74	Surajpahar (Malitoke)	Gurudeo Singh .	Malitoke . .	Do. .	Do.
75	Taljhari old latorite quarry.	Permanand Marwari	Khairboni . .	Do. .	Do.
76	Salcempore . . .	J. N. Mukherjee .	Salcempur . .	Bhagalpur	Bhagalp
77	Karjura . . .	Ramlal Basantlal .	Karjura . . .	Gaya .	Gaya.
78	Pirpahar . . .	Bengal and N. W. Railway.	Sukhurpur . .	Monghyr .	Monghy
79	Girhinda . . .	Melaram and Basantlal.	Girhinda . . .	Do.* .	Do.
80	Bodma . . .	A. V. Sam . . .	Bodma . . .	Jamtara .	Sonthal Parganas.
81	Tinpahar . . .	Chatterjee, Shaw and Company	Tinpahar . . .	Rajmahal .	Do.
82	Maharajpur (Locally known as Sahibganj Block No. I).	Birendra Nath Shah	Matijharna . .	Do. .	Do.
83	Tinpahar . . .	Seth Teomal . .	Tinpahar . . .	Do. .	Do.
84	Pirpahar . . .	Rajshahi Stone and Coal Agency.	Dargadanga . .	Do. .	Do.
85	Tinpahar . . .	Ditto . . .	Tinpahar . . .	Do. .	Do.
86	Dhanghara . . .	Shivanand Shivamay and Company.	Pakur . .	Do.
87	Durgapur . . .	Ditto	Do. .	Do.
88	Ghorapahari . .	Seth Teomal . .	Ghorapahari . .	Do. .	Do.
89	Tinpahar . . .	Shivanand Shivamay and Company.	Tinpahar . . .	Rajmahal .	Do.
90	Pretsilla . . .	Shamji Ratansi .	Near Niazpur .	Gaya Sadar	Gaya.
91	Sikoria . . .	Seth Premchand .	Sikoria . . .	Sasaram .	Shahbad
92	Madhavi Ramsila .	Abdul Jalil . .	Chotki Nawada .	Gaya-Sadar	Gaya.
93	Kanchanpur . .	Khublal . . .	Kanchanpur . .	Sasaram .	Shahbad.
94	Jojobera . . .	Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.	Jojebera . . .	Jamshedpur	Singhbhum.
95	Damadama . . .	Lokenath Works.	Damadama . .	Pakur . .	Sonthal Parganas.
96	Damadama . . .	Vivekanand Works.	Do. . . .	Do. .	Do.
97	Gumapahar . .	Nanji Mowji . .	Banopahar . .	Rajmahal .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BIHAR—contd.					
Stone Mines—contd.					
98	Murgidanga	Gurdeo Singh & Sons.	Murgadanga	Pakur	Sonthal Parganas.
99	Burhan	Rohtas Quarries Ltd.	Burhan	Sasaram	Sasaram.
100	Ramsilla	Vithal Mea	Tatwari	Gaya	Gaya.
101	Fazilpur	Shevak Lall	Karwandia	Sasaram	Sasaram
102	Manpur Hill	Sitaram Singh	Baniadganj	Gaya	Gaya.
103	Ramsilla	R. K. Dey	Bageswari	Do.	Do.
104	Ramsilla	L. N. Aggarwalla	Nowadah	Do.	Do.
105	Kalajore	Memraj Mull and Horda Mull.	Kalajora	Pakur	Sonthal Parganas.
106	Kumarpur	Pakur Stone Co.	Kumarpur	Do.	Do.
107	Salagoria	Gurdeo Singh & Sons	Salagoria	Do.	Do.
108	Baghajuli	Bhagwandas Chanchaldas.	Baghajuli	Do.	Do.
109	Baghajuli	B. R. Industries Ltd.	Do.	Do.	Do.
110	Malpahari, Ghora-pahari and Kusumdanga.	Pakur Quarries Ltd.	Malpahari	Do.	Do.
111	Malpahari and Manjurkola.	A. Sarkar and Co.	Do.	Do.	Do.
112	Nildih	G. B. Thakar & Sons	Nildih	Jamshedpur	Singbhum.
113	Nildih	V. R. Patel and Co.	Do.	Do.	Do.
114	Sanjai	Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.	Sanjai	Kharsawan and Serai-kela.	Do.
115	Amari Hill	Suraj Balli Sinha and Sachhidananda Sinha.	Amari Hill	Sasaram	Shahabad.
116	All excavations of stone in the Manpur, Manpur-Abgilla, Manpur, Abgilla, Garey, Ramshilla and Garey, Ramshilla and Pretshilla Hills.			Gaya	Gaya.
117	Tinpahar	Sri Krishna Pathak.	Tinpahar	Pakur	Pakur.
118	Barharwa	Eastern Railway	Barharwa	Pakur	Sonthal Parganas.
Fireclay Mines					
1	Merrah	Bengal Coal Co., Ltd.	Merrah	...	Manbhum.
2	Sangamohal	Bihar Firebricks and Potteries, Ltd.	Sangamchal	Dhanbad	Do.
3	Chatabar	Do.	Chatabar	Do.	Do.
4	Rangamatia	Burn & Co., Ltd.	Rangamatia	Do.	Do.
5	Gulfarbari	Do.	Gulfarbari	Do.	Do.
6	Mugma Birsingpur	D. N. Choudhury	Mugma Birsingpur	Do.	Do.
7	Kapasara	Amir Ahmed Khan.	Kapasara	Do.	Do.
8	Palasia	Alladad Khan	Palasia	Do.	Do.
9	Jograd	Dina Nath Goral	Jograd	Do.	Do.
10	Kethardih	Haripada Goswami	Kethardih	Do.	Do.
11	Sulanga	D. N. Choudhury	Sulanga	Do.	Do.
12	Rajhara	Bengal Coal Co., Ltd.	Pandua	Palamau	Palamau.
13	Dhura	Behar Fire Bricks and Potteries, Ltd.	Dhurna	Dhanbad	Manbhum.
14	Nepura	Reliance Fire Bricks and Pottery Co., Ltd.	Nepura	Do.	Do.
15	Mugma	Behar Fire Bricks and Potteries Co., Ltd.	Mugma	Do.	Do.
16	Palasia	Haripada Goswami	Palasia	Do.	Do.
17	Palasia No. 2	Haripada Goswami	Palasia	Do.	Do.
18	Kharimati and Chotorampur.	D. N. Ray and others	Kharimati and Chotorampur.	Jamtara	Sonthal Parganas.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BIHAR—concl'd.					
<i>Fireclay Mines—cont'd</i>					
19	Bundu . . .	Karanpura Develop- ment Co., Ltd.	Bundu . . .	Hazaribagh	Hazaribagh
20	Ghorapahari . .	Gurdeo Singh and Sons.	Ghorapahari . .	Pakur	Sonthal Parganas.
<i>Limestone Mines</i>					
1	Ray-Dundu . . .	National Cement, Mines and Indus- tries Ltd.	Ray-Dundu . . .	Ranchi	Ranchi.
2	Khalari . . .	Associated Cement Company Ltd.	Khalari . . .	Do.	Do.
3	Pusalata and Govindpur.	Porhat Stone Lime Company.	Pusalata and Govindpur.	Chakradhar- pur.	Singhthum.
4	Dumbhari . . .	Rameswar Prasad Chowdhury.	Dumbhari . . .	Chaibassa	Do.
5	Bundu . . .	Karanpura Develop- ment Co., Ltd.	Bundu . . .	Hazaribagh	Hazaribagh.
6	Rajanka . . .	Associated Cement Co., Ltd.	Rajanka . . .	Chaibassa	Singhthum.
<i>Sandstone Mines</i>					
1	Amra and Amri . .	Ramlobhi Singh and Reliram Melaram.	Amari . . .	Sasaram	Shahabad.
<i>Bauxite Mines</i>					
1	Bagru Hill . . .	Indian Aluminium Co., Ltd.	Bagra . . .	Ranchi	Ranchi.
2	Charupi . . .	Aluminium Corpora- tion of India, Ltd.	Charupi . . .	Do.	Do.
BOMBAY					
<i>Stone Mines</i>					
1	Danda Govt. Quarry	Govt. of Bombay, Revenue Deptt.	Danda . . .	South Sal- sette.	Bombay Suburban.
2	Danda Municipal Quarry.	Bandra Municipality	Do.	Do.	Do.
3	Sevalia . . .	B.B. & C.I. Rly.	Sevalia . . .	Thusra	Kaira.
4	Orwad . . .	Walji Bhimji . .	Orwad . . .	Bulsar	Surat.
5	Khadki . . .	Arjun Mayji . .	Khadki . . .	Do.	Do.
6	Motiwada . . .	Jaganji Dayabhai Patel.	Motiwada . . .	Do.	Do.
7	Ratlao . . .	B.B. & C.I. Rly.	Ratlao . . .	Do.	Do.
8	Kachora . . .	G.I.P. Rly. . .	Kachora . . .	Kalyan	Thana.
9	Anik . . .	Bombay Port Trust	Anik and Mohul	...	Bombay Suburban.
10	Virar . . .	B.B. & C.I. Rly.	Virar . . .	Bassein	Thana.
11	Kandivli . . .	Govt. of Bombay, Public Works Deptt.	Kandivli . . .	Salsette	Bombay Suburban.
12	Kandivli . . .	Govt. of Bombay, Revenue Deptt.	Do.	Do.	Do.
13	Malad . . .	Ditto	Malad . . .	Do.	Do.
14	Gilbert Hill Andheri Quarries.	Govt. of Bombay	Andheri . . .	South Sal- sette.	Do.
15	Sevella . . .	Tribhubandas Harji	Sevalla . . .	Thusra	Kaira.
16	Dekor (Jablarka- handi.)	B.B. & C.I. Rly.	Ralchial Jakbad and Kalscar.	...	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BOMBAY—contd.					
<i>Stone Mines—contd.</i>					
17	Gilbert Hill	(1) S. M. Shah (2) Bombay Construction. (3) Patkar and Sons. (4) Subarban Stone Supply. (5) District Local Board. (6) Ashrafkhan Amir Khan.	Andheri	Andheri	Andheri.
18	Udalpur	S.I. Works Quarry, Ltd.	Udalpur	Sevalia	Baroda.
19	Khadki	Sardar Stone Ltd.	Khirkhi	Balsor	Surat.
20	Udwada	Dhanraj J. Parmar and Hiralal R. Shah.	Udwada	Do.	Do.
21	Devnor	H. D. Billimoria	Devnor	Greater Bombay.	Bombay.
22	Kurla Kiroli Hill	Yunus Transport Company.	Ghatkopar	Do.	Greater Bombay.
23	Kurla Kiroli Hill	British Indian Electric and Osy-Acetylene Welding Company.	Do.	Do.	Do.
24	Kurla Kiroli Hill	Bharat Quarries	Do.	Do.	Do.
25	Kurla Kiroli Hill	Shri Narayan Amarchand.	Do.	Do.	Do.
26	Kurla Kiroli Hill	Shakti Quarries	Do.	Do.	Do.
27	Kurla Kiroli Hill	Jally Brothers	Do.	Do.	Do.
28	Kurla Kiroli Hill	S. B. Bakshi Dilip Singh & Sons, Ltd.	Do.	Do.	Do.
29	Mohili	Mohili Metal Crushing Company.	Mohili	Do.	Do.
30	Pawai Hill	Hiralal and Company	Pawai	Do.	Do.
31	Chandivali	Chandivali Construction and Communication Ltd.	Chandivali	Do.	Do.
32	Pawai Hill	Morarji and Co.	Pawai	Do.	Do.]
33	Sydney	Sydney Quarries	Ghatkopar	Do.	Do.]
34	Pawai Hill	Patkar Constructions Company.	Pawai	Do.	Do.
35	Motiwada	Pragji Mithulbhai Patel.	Motiwada	Bulsar	Surat.
36	Gawanpada	Lalji Brothers	Gawanpada	Greater Bombay.	Greater Bombay.
37	Bhaiwada	Bombay Stone Quarries.	Bhaiwada	Thana	Thana.
38	Orwad	Chandulal Laji Shah	Orwad	Bulsar	Surat.
39	Gilbert Hill East	Khan Mohammad Jumma	Gilbert Hill Survey No. 109.	Greater Bombay.	Greater Bombay.
<i>Limestone Mine</i>					
1	Sevalia	Associated Cement Co., Ltd.	Bir-ki-Mohady.	Balasinor Taluka.	Kaira.
<i>Bauxite Mine</i>					
1	Taiyabpur Bauxite Mine.	Killick, Nixon & Co.	Taiyabpur	Kapadvanj Taluka.	Kaira.

1	2	3	4	5	6
BOMBAY—concl'd.					
<i>Clay Mine</i>					

1	Gulab Chand Hem- raj.	Mrs. Rukminibai, widow of Mr. Kusha- bhai and Mr. Nana- lal,	Handinbal .	Honavar .	North Kanara.
---	--------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------	-----------	------------------

HYDERABAD

Limestone Mines

1	Bankur (Shahabad)	Associated Cement Company, Ltd.	Bankur .	Chitapur .	Gulburga.
---	-------------------	------------------------------------	----------	------------	-----------

MADHYA PRADESH

Stone Mines

1	Paras .	G.I.P. Railway	Paras .	Balapur .	Akola (Berar.)
2	Katepurna .	Ditto .	Katepurna .	Murtizapur	Do.
3	Wai .	Ditto .	Wai .	Chandur	Amraoti.
4	Konda Nalla .	Rajawasta, Contractor	Konda .	Bhandak .	Chanda.
5	Borkhedi .	Ditto .	Borkhedi	Nagpur.
6	Salbardi Paras .	Dulekhan .	Salbordi .	Multai .	Batul,

Limestone Mines

1	Baraduar .	Tata Iron & Steel Co., Ltd.	Dumarpara	Bilaspur.
2	Paraghat .	Jairam Valjee .	Parsoda and Khaira	...	Do.
3	Latiya Quarry .	R. S. Jairam Valjee, P.O. Raigarh (C.P.)	Latiya, P. C. No. 180.	Tahsil Janj- gir.	Do.
4	Pakariya Quarry .	Babu Arjun Purohit, P.O. Akaltara, Distt. Bilaspur.	Pakaria P.C. No. 180.	Do.	Do.
5	Latiya Quarry .	R. S. Mulji Jagmal P.O. Bilaspur (C.P.)	Latiya P. C. No. 180.	Do.	Do.
6	Doomarpara Quarry	Shri S. K. Mukherjee, P.O. Kharasia.	Doomarpara .	Do.	Do.
7	Doomarpara Quarry	Chota Nagpur Forest Syndicate, P.O. Kharasia.	Do.	Do.	Do.
8	Wanjari (Survey Nos. 107 and 108.)	M. D'Costa of Nag- pur.	Wanjari .	Wun .	Yeotmal.
9	Wanjari (Survey Nos. 108.)	J. D'Costa of Nagpur	Do.	Do.	Do.
10	Wanjari (Survey No. 134.)	Ditto .	Do.	Do.	Do.
11	Wanjari (Survey Nos. 114 and 110.)	Ditto .	Do.	Do.	Do.
12	Wanjari (Survey Nos. 93 and 97.)	Shri A. H. Wasudeo- rao and Brothers.	Do.	Do.	Do.
13	Wanjari (Survey No. 134.)	Leban Leyland Ltd.	Do.	Do.	Do.
14	Wanjari (Survey No. 108.)	E. De. Figuerido .	Do.	Do.	Do.
15	Wanjari (Survey No. 107.)	Shri J. M. Steneus .	Do.	Do.	Do.
16	Wanjari (Survey No. 107.)	Ditto .	Do.	Do.	Do.
17	Wanjari (Survey No. 113 and 128).	Sri G. M. Dafde .	Do.	Do.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

MADHYA PRADESH—contd.

Lim. Stone Mines—contd.

18	Majra (Survey No. 39).	J.D's Costa Nagpur.	of Majra	Wun	Yeotmal.
19	Majra (Survey No. 40).	Do	Do	Do	Do.
20	Majra (Survey No. 41).	Sm. Sonabai Gunpatrao.	Do	Do	Do.
21	Majra (Survey No. 40).	Ditto	Do	Do	Do.
22	Sonapur (Survey No. 16).	Sri F. X. Reballo	Sonapur	Do	Do.
23	Sonapur (Survey No. 13).	Ditto	Do	Do	Do.
24	Sonapur (Survey No. 15 and 16)	Ditto	Do	Do	Do.
25	Sonapur (Survey No. 32).	Shekani Lime Works, Rajur.	Do	Do	Do.
26	Sonapur (Survey No. 3, 4 14, and 33)	Ditto	Do	Do	Do.
27	Sonapur (Survey No. 2 and 32).	Shri Issa Noor Mohd.	Do	Do	Do.
28	Nagala (Survey No. 6).	Shri F. X. Rebello.	Nagala	Do	Do.
29	Gowaral (Survey No. 25).	Shri B. H. Damle	Gawaral	Do	Do.
30	Majra (39 & 40)	Ganpat Rao Laxman Rao.	Majra	Do	Do.
31	Sonapur	Habib Dada Chanawala.	Sonapur	Do	Do.
32	R. S. Hiralal Shamji's Lime-stone Quarry	R. S. Hiralal Shamji	Biladih	Sakti	Raigarh.
33	Rajur Lime stone	Ganpatrao Laxman rao.	Rajur	Wani	Yeotmal.

Ochre Mines.

1	Bhiwkhund	Hashambhoy & Sons	Bhiwkhund	Chanda.
2	Haveli Range	Abdul Hussain-mulls Hasanally	Haveli Range	Do.
3	Saliya S. No. 306 Chalk Clay Ochre.	Seth Gangadhar Rameshwardas.	Salaiya	Katni Jubbulpore.

Fuller's Earth Mine.

1	Tikuria	G. H. Cook & Sons	Tikuria	Jubbulpore.
---	---------	-------------------	---------	-------------

Fireclay Mines.

1	Hardua	Burn & Co. Ltd.	Hardua	Katni	Jubbulpore.
2	Pit No. 1	Ditto	Shoiteria	Do.	Do.
3	Hardua	Lately owned by Kalyanji Govindji.	Hardua	Do.	Do.
4	Polipathar	Perfect Pottery Co. Ltd.	Polipathar	Katni	Jubbulpore.

Bauxite Mines.

1	Tikuri	K. P. Pandey	Tikuri	Murwara	Jubbulpore
2	Do.	C. L. Pathak & Sons.	Do.	Do.	Do.
3	Khajuri Kusmi	Macpherson & Co.	Khajuri Kusmi	Do.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
MADHYA PRADESH—contd.					
<i>Bauxite Mines—contd.</i>					
4	Tikuri	N. Venkata Ramana and Sons.	Tikuri	Katni	Jubbulpore
5	Roadside	Associated Cement Co. Ltd.	..	Do.	Do.
6	Tikuri	C. L. Pathak & Sons.	Tikuri	Do.	Do.
7	Tikuri L. No. 187.	G. H. Cook & Sons	Do.	Do.	Do.
8	Sudiary	Associated Cement Co. Ltd.	..	Do.	Do.
9	Khujuri	Macpherson and Co.	Khujuri	Katni	Do.
10	Roadside	Associated Cement Co. Limited.	Tikuri	Katni	Do.
<i>Steatite Mines.</i>					
1	Koda	S. Binaychand Golcha.	Koda	Katni	Do.
2	Jhlmrall	The Birendra Singh	Bhatgowan Sun-hera.	Murwara	Do.
3	Gaurishankar	Mamta Kumari Chowhan Minor Guardian of Shri L. S. Chowhan.	Bheraghat	Jubbulpore	Do.
<i>Sand Mine.</i>					
1	Chuthai sand quarry area 2.5 acres	Tourai Shree Onama Glass Works Ltd.	Garha	Jubbulpore	Do.
<i>Clay Mines.</i>					
1	Lamehtaghat	Burn and Company Limited.	Lametaghat	Jubbulpore	Jubbulpore.
2	Sudiary	Associated Cement Co. Ltd.	Tikuri	Katni	Do.
3	Garha	Shri Onama Glass Works, Limited.	Gouraha	Jubbulpore	Do.
4	Bhaganwara Clay Quarry over area 70.40 acres.	Associated Cement Co. Ltd.,	Bhaganwara	Sihora	Jubbulpore.
5	Chuli Clay & Silica Quarry over 2.12 acres.	V.M. Kulkarni	Churoaitoila	Jubbulpore	Do.
DELHI					
<i>Stone Mines.</i>					
1	Mochibagh	Lala Sadhu Mall	Mochibagh	Delhi	Delhi
2	Jhandewala	Public Works Deptt.	Jhandewala Estate	Do.	Do.
3	Idgah No. 1	Do	Do.	Do.	Do.
4	Idgah No. 2	Public Works Department and Delhi Municipal Committee.	Delhi Municipality.	Do.	Do.
5	Bagh Mochi	Public Works Deptt.	Arakpur Mochi.	Bagh	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

DELHI—contd.

Stone Mines—contd.

6	Mutiny Memorial Road.	Sunjhai Nath	Notified Delhi.	Area	Delhi	Delhi
7	Rattlawali	Ch. Sada Ram	Sadhaura Khurd		Do.	Do.
8	Do.	Mst. Pholla	Do.		Do.	Do.
9	Do.	Ch. Ram Kishan	Do.		Do.	Do.
10	Do.	Ch. Ram Singh	Do.		Do.	
11	Do.	Ch. Bhagwan Das	Do.		Do.	Do.
12	Do.	Ch. Jagdish Prashad	Do.		Do.	Do.
13	Do.	Tara Chand	Do.		Do.	Do.
14	Do.	Mst. Sukh Devi	Do.		Do.	Do.
15	Do.	Proprietary body of the village.	Khampur Raya		Do.	Do.
16	Idgah No. 1	Mutwali Idgah-Mian Jami-ru-Rahman.	Delhi		Do.	Do.

MADRAS.

1	Pallavaram	Madras Corporation	Pallavaram	Saidapet Tq.	Chingleput.
2	Pallavaram No. 3	Cantonment Authority	St. Thomas Mount Pallavaram.	Do.	Do.
3	Pallavaram	Mahdi Hussain Khan.	Pallavaram	Do.	Do.
4	Trisulam	Madras Port Trust	Trisulam	Do.	Do.
5	Thattankunn Meonambakam.	Garrison Engineer, Military. Deptt. Fort St. George, Madras.	Trisulam		
6	Agraharam (S. No. 11).	Dorbalapeda Venkata Sastry.	Kolankunda	Manglagiri	Guntur.
7	Kolankunda (S. No. 12).	M. & S. M. Railway.	Kolankunda	Do.	Do.
8	Kolankunda	Public Works Deptt. Krishna Western Division, Vijayavada.	Do.	Do.	Do.
9	Kolankunda	District Board, Guntur.	Do.	Do.	Do.
10	Tadepalli	Do.	Tadepalli	Do.	Do.
11	Tadepalli and Sitanagaram.	Public Works Deptt. Krishna Western Division Vijayavada.	Do.	Do.	Do.
12	Sitanagaram (S. No. 344/6).	Do.	Sitanagaram	Do.	Do.
13	Tadepalli	Lately owned by Municipal Council, Tanali.	Tadepalli	Do.	Do.
14	Katheru	A. Lakshamana Swamy Naidu and others.	Katheru	Rajmundry	East Godavari.
15	Molagupparai	Military Department.	Tiruchirappalli	Tiruchirappalli.	Tiruchirappalli.
16	Saipparai	South Indian Railway.	Edamalapet	Do.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
MADRAS—contd.					
17	Mogalraipuram	Government of Madras, Public Works Department.	Mogalraipuram	Vijayavada Taluk.	Kistna.
18	Pakkam . . .	South Indian Railway.	Pakkam . . .	Maduranta-kam Taluk.	Chingleput.
19	Stone Quarry .	Ditto . . .	Paranur No. 209 of Tirukkoyilur.		Arcot.
20	Veli Quarry .	Ditto . . .	Between miles Q 508/10 and Q 509/1.	..	Tirunelveli.
21	Mile Q 460/r6-17 Q. 461/0-2 and Q 461/16-19	Ditto . . .	Between Katharakara and Ezhukone Stations (Shen-cottah Quilon Section).	..	Do.
22	Vayalur (S. No. 155-2-B)	V. Mathu . . .	Vayalur Vriddachalam Taluq.	Vriddachalam Taluq.	South Arcot
23	Vayalur (S. No. 155).	Government of Madras Revenue Department.	Vayalur Vriddachalam Taluq.	Vriddachalam	South Arcot
24	Tiruvakkarai and Nemali	Ditto . . .	Tiruvakari and Nemali, Tindivanam Taluq.	Tin-divanem	Do.
25	Siruvakkur and Kalpathu.	Ditto . . .	Siruvakkur and Kalpathu Villupuram Taluq.	Villupuram	Do.
26	Kuthimalai .	G. S. Guandikam Pillai.	Pirattiyur . . .	Tiruchhapallai	Tiruchirappalli.
27	Khajamalaipatti (S.F. 178)	Gunna J. Krishnam & Brothers.	Abhisheka puram.	Do. .	Do.
28	Palamatti (S.F. 248/2).	S. M. Ramasubramanya Ayyar South Indian Railway Co. Ltd.	Pirattiyur . . .	Do. .	Do.
29	Vadamalapuram ,	South Indian Railway Co. Ltd.	At mile Q391 8-9 on Tenkasi Chord Line.	Kovilpatti	Tirunelveli.
30	Iringal Amsem .	Ditto . . .	Iringal . . .	Kurumb-ranad.	Malabar.
31	Thuvakudi (S.F. No. 593)	Shivashankar Unnayathuriyan and N. Manikkam Pillai	Thuvakudi . . .	Tiruchirappalli	Tiruchirappalli.
32	Mulaguparai (S.F. No. 43)	Jainullabuddin, A.M.	Abishakapuram .	Do.	Do.
33	Karithipalamala	Shri E. K. Venkatasam.	Betamchera (Panchayat Forest)	Dhone Taluk	Kurnool.
34	Peddajarla Konda	Shri B.Y. Joshi .	S. No. 379 of Paddayachavaram.	Markapur Taluk.	..
35	All quarries in Zamin Hill.	District Collector, Chingleput.	Zamin Hill .	Saidapet Taluk	Chingleput
36	Katheru (3 Quarries).	Engineers & Traders Ltd.	Katheru . . .	Rajamundry	East Godavari.
37	Katheru . . .	Isukapalli Gangaraju	Do. . .	Do. .	Do.
38	Do. . .	Gadireddy Narasinha Rao.	Do. . .	Do. .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
MADRAS—contd.					
39	Katheru . . .	Polisetty Laksmiah	Katheru . . .	Rajahmundry East Godavari	
40	Do. . .	Pasamu Raja Rao .	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
41	Do. . .	Sheikh Dadasaheb .	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
42	Do. (2 Quarries)	Sm. Korasika Kam-magaru	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
43	Katheru . . .	Padala Krishniah .	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
44	Do. . .	Akula Satyam .	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
45	Do. . .	Kalidindhi Subbar-aju.	Ditto . . .	Do. . .	Do.
46	Do. . .	Isukapalli Veerama	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
47	Do. (2 Quarries).	Akula Krishna-murthy.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
48	Katheru . . .	Adi Andhra Co-operative Society Ltd.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
49	Do. . .	Sagaraja Ramraju .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
50	Do. . .	Nudrogada Satya-narayana.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
51	Gundala . . .	National Quarry Workers Co-operative Central Society Ltd.	Gundala . . .	Vijayavada Taluk	Krishna.
52	Ibrahimpattanam Group mines. of	Government of Madras in the Revenue Department.	Ibrahimpattanam .	Vinayawada	Do.
53	Do. . .	Government of Madras in the Forest Department.	Do . . .	Do. . .	Do.
54	Narasinhakonda	Collector, Nellore .	Nellore . . .	Nellore . . .	Nellore.
55	Kacheri Mullai	Parthasarathi Pillai	Pallavaram . . .	Saidapet Tq.	Chingleput
Barytes Mines.					
1	Block Nos. 21 and 21/A.	B. P. Seshareddy	Kommemari	Dohne . . .	Kurnool.
2	Betamcherla R.F.	Ditto . . .	Kolumalappalli .	Do. . .	Do.
3	Vemula S. Nos. 981/5, 978 & 979).	A. Krishnappa & Sons.	Vemula . . .	Pulivendla Taluk.	Cuddapah.
4	Nandippalli . . .	Do . . .	Kothapalli (S. Nos. 517/2 & 517/3).	Do. . .	Do.
5	Vemula (S. No. 981/4).	Tiffin & Co. . .	Vemula . . .	Do. . .	Do.
6	Vemula (S. No. 1021).	Do . . .	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.
7	Kothapalli (S. No. 288)	Do . . .	Kothapalli . . .	Do. . .	Do.
8	Vemula . . .	C. C. Obeyya Chetty.	Vemula . . .	Do. . .	Do.
9	Narayanraswamy	Rai Bahadur B. P. Sessa Reddy.	Do . . .	Do. . .	Do.
10	Nunabodu-Dosalo-lodu.	V. Nimbakar . . .	Machakota . . .	Muchakota Tadripatri Taluk.	Anantapur
11	Nandipalle . . .	B. P. Sessa Reddy Gauru.	Nandipalle . . .	Pulvendala	Cuddapah.
12	Ippatla . . .	S.S. Gurzdar	Ippatla . . .	Do. . .	Do.
13	Gourishankar	Sri Radhakrishna Mining and Pulversing Co.	Do. . .	Do. . .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

MADRAS—concl'd.

Barytes Mines—cont'd.

14	Naddi Konda	Mr. Ashrod Hos-sain Khan.	Jaladugram (Reserved Forest).	Dhone Taluk.	Kurnool.
15	Muddonikunta	Sri V. Nimbkar	Nalla Mekalapalle (Reserved Forest).	Do.	Do.
16	Bapanagondi	Do.	Jaladugram (Reserved Forest).	Do.	Do.
17	Chiguralapeta	S. S. Guzdar	(a) 37-90 acres in S. No. 574, (b) 5-73 acres in S. No. 243-A of Mutchukota.	Tadpatri	Anantpur.
18	Madwhani-Kunta	V. Nimbkar	Nallamekalapalle Reserved Forest, Dhone, Range.	Dhone	Kurnool.

Limestone Mines

1	Madukkarai	Coimbatore Cement Co. Ltd.	Madukkarai	Coimbatore	Coimbatore.
2	Buggapalli	Hajee Sheik Meeran Sahib.	Dhone	Dhone	Kurnool.
3	Sitharampuram	Associated Cement Co. Ltd.	Sitharampuram	Gurzalla Taluk.	Guntur.
4	Kaza	Do.	Kaza	Guntur	Do.
5	Kalakudi	Dalmia Cement Co. Ltd.	Kalakudi	Lalgudi	Tiruchirappalli.
6	Sankaridrag	Methur Chemical & Industrial Corporation, Ltd.	27-83 acres in Inam Iveli.	Tiruchengoda.	Salem.
7	Thaliyahu	India Cement Ltd.	Thaliyuthu	Tirunelveli	Tirunelveli.

Lime Stone Mines

1	Konnuppapalad	Buckingham & Carnatic Co. Ltd.	Konnuppapalad	Tadiparti	Anantapur.
2	Nadikudi	Andhra Cement Co. Ltd.	Nadikudi	Dochapatti	Guntur.

Ochre Mines

1	S. No. 1176	R. Ranganathaiyar	Betamcherla	Dhone	Kurnool.
2	Sudda Quarry	Sri T. Naga Bhusanam	S. No. 273 of Ambapuram.	Dhone Taluq	Do.
3	Suddaguntalachenu.	Sri D. R. S. Venkataradi Sudda, Merchant.	S. No. 272 of Ambapuram.	Do.	Do.

Slate Mine

1	Mine east of Nallayani.	Sirasnagandla Subarayudu and others.	Within the limits of Kethagudiipi Aggrahan.	Podile Taluq.	Nellore.
---	-------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	---------------	----------

Bauxite Mine.

1	Shivaroy	Shervaroya Bauxite Products Co. Ltd.	Pulliyar, Semmaduva and Mavjakuttai.	Yercand	Salem.
---	----------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	--------

Clay Mine.

1	Nileshwar	C. Samuel Aaron	Pudukai	Puttur	South Kanara.
---	-----------	-----------------	---------	--------	---------------

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

MYSORE.

Stone Mines.

1	Sonnahalli (Quartz).	Mysore Glass & Enamel Works Ltd.	Sonnahalli .	Bangalore Taluk.	Bangalore.
2	Billikalbetta (Quartz).	Mysore Iron and Steel Works.	Hunasekatte	Bhadrabati Taluk.	Shomoga.

ORISSA

Fireclay Mine.

1	Belpahar .	Tata Iron and Steel Co. Ltd.	Joraboja .	Sambalpur	Sambalpur
---	------------	------------------------------	------------	-----------	-----------

PATIALA AND EAST PUNJAB STATES UNION.

Lime Stone Mines.

1	N.C.W. Malla .	Patiala Cement Co. Ltd.	Malla .	Kandaghat	Kandaghat
2	Dhani Bathutha	Chiranjilal .	Dhani Bathutha .	Mahendra-garh	Mahendra-garh.

UTTAR PRADESH.

Stone Mines.

1	Shankergarh .	Sheikh Hidayatullah	Tala .	Allahabad	Allahabad.
2	Do. .	Jethanand .	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
3	Do. .	Govindram Sindhi .	Benipur .	Do. .	Do.
4	Do. .	Pars Ram .	Shankergarh .	Do. .	Do.
5	Hajitola (Shan- kergarh).	Govindram Sindhi .	Hajitola .	Do. .	Do.
6	Lakhanpur (Shankergarh).	L.P. Pandey & Sons	Lakhanpur .	Do. .	Do.
7	Kulmajra .	Daya Krishan Kapur.	Kulmajra .	Maw .	Banda
8	Kulmajra .	Lala Prig Narain Tandan.	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
9	Do. .	Bhagwandin .	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
10	Sheora .	Nazir Hussain .	Gulpura .	Jhansi-Math.	Jhansi
11	Do. .	Ram Charan & Ram Gopal.	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
12	Do. .	Debi Sahal and Kali Charan.	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
13	Do. .	Murlidhar and Tek-Chand.	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
14	Chandpur Ja-hazpur.	Randhir Singh .	Chandpur Jahaz-pur.	Lalitpur .	Do.
15	Do. .	Shiam Lal Tara Chand and Company.	Jhilgwan .	Do. .	Do.
16	Hardari Nos. 1 and 2.	Pt. Shiamlal Tarachand and Company.	Hardari .	Do. .	Do
17	Sheora Hill .	G. I. P. Railway (Contractor Uma Shankar).	Todi .	Jhansi .	Do.
18	Marwari Siding No. 4.	Gobind Ram .	Shankergarh	Allahabad	Allahabad
19	Badama .	Lakshmi Narayan Gupta.	Lakhanpur and Tala	Do. .	Do.

1	2	3	4	5	6
UTTAR PRADESH—contd.					
Stone Mines—contd.					
20	Shankargarh No. 2 E. I. R. Quarry, or Lakhampur Quarry No. 2	Seth Basant Ram Lakhampur . Sindh.	.	Allahabad .	Allahabad.
21	Rampura .	Pandit Shiamlal Rampura . Tara Chand & Co.	.	Lalitpur .	Jhansi.
22	Shankargarh No. 1 E. I. R. Stone Quarry.	Seth Basant Ram Lakhampur . Sindh.	.	Allahabad	Allahabad.
23	Lohogora .	Sheikh Hidayetullah.	Lohogora .	Kurchana .	Do.
24	Lohgara .	Aurur Singh .	Lohgara .	Allahabad	Do.
25	Do. .	Ramdas Sharma .	Lohgara .	Kurchana.	Do.
26	Lohgara .	Syed Ali .	Lohgara .	Do. .	Do.
27	Do. .	Bharat Singh .	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
28	Jurwat .	Athumal .	Jurwat .	Karchhana	Do.
29	Jhilgawan .	Pandit Shiamlal Jhilgawan . Tara Chand & Co.	.	Lalitpur .	Jhansi
30	Deoria .	Ramanand .	Deoria .	Allahabad	Allahabad
31	Shankargarh No. 5.	L. D. Kamra .	Sheorajpur .	Do. .	Do.
Ochre Mine.					
1	Lakhanpur .	R. P. Mustaphy .	Lakhanpur .	..	Banda.
VINDHYA PRADESH					
Lime Stone Mines					
1	Hardua .	Baghelkhand Products Ltd.	Hardua .	Satna	Satna.
2	Karhi & Bhad .	Dyer's Stone Lime Co. Ltd.	Karhi & Bhad .	Do. .	Do.
3	Silanti .	Sarna Stone Lime Co.	Silanti .	Maihar .	Do.
4	Parsokha .	Ramphul Tiwari .	Parsokha .	Do. .	Do.
5	Paheri .	Baghelkhand Products Ltd.	Paheri .	Do. .	Do.
6	Do. .	United Trading Co. (Pratap Singh).	Do. .	Do. .	Do.
7	Narora .	S.N. Sundarson & Co.	Narora .	Do. .	Do.
8	Amilia .	Dewan Lime Co. .	Amilia .	Do. .	Do.
9	Pahari .	Chowsasia Stone Lime Co.	Pahari .	Do. .	Do.
10	Dayanpur .	Ditto .	Dayanpur .	Satna	Do.
11	Pahari .	Uttam Chand Awal	Pahari & Lakhampur, Sonewari.	Do. .	Do.
12	Girgitta .	Maihar Stone Lime Co. Ltd.	Girgitta & Sonewari.	Maihar .	Do.
13	Dewan & Rewra	Janhar Mineral supply Co. Ltd.	Dewra .	Sohawal .	Do.
14	Raghurajnagar]	Satna Stone & Lime Co. Ltd.	Raghurajnagar .	Satna .	Do.
15	Majhgawan .	Dewan Lime Company.	Majgawan .	Raghuraj nagar.	Do.

APPENDIX II.

FORM OF REPORT

[See condition (1) in the third column relating to entry I in first column of Schedule.]

1. Name and situation of the mine.
2. Name of mineral worked.
3. Name and postal address of owner.
4. Name and postal address of manager.
5. Depth of the mine measured from its highest to its lowest point.
6. Number of persons employed in the mine.
7. Whether explosives are used in the mine.
8. The general condition of the mine as to safety in working.
9. Whether underground workings have been made or are likely to be made.
10. The date on which the mine was opened (for new mines only).

Date.....

Signature of owner, agent or
manager.

[No. M-46(4)/53.]

P. N. SHARMA, Under Secy.

